	Page 1
1	THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
2	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
3	PUBLIC MEETING #137
4	
5	
6	CHAIRMAN
7	Stephen P. Crosby
8	
9	COMMISSIONERS
10	Gayle Cameron
11	James F. McHugh
12	Bruce W. Stebbins
13	Enrique Zuniga
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	October 23, 2014 9:30 a.m 3:49 p.m.
21	BOSTON CONVENTION AND EXHIBITION CENTER
22	415 Summer Street, Room 102B
23	Boston, Massachusetts
24	

## PROCEEDINGS:

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are calling to order the 137th of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission on October 23, 2014 at the Convention Center.

The first item on the agenda is approval of minutes, Commissioner McHugh.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: There are several sets of minutes in the book, Mr.

Chairman. So, I am fully prepared to deal with them seriatim. So, I would first ask that we take up the minutes of meeting 134, which was the licensing hearing set of minutes.

I'm going to recommend that we make two additions though to those minutes. The first is in -- both are in the list of documents used at the meeting. I would recommend that we change the initial listing which simply says documents, presentations so that we list each of the presentations, the five presentations so that it's clear what we are talking about there.

And then finally that we add to the

1 list of documents the signed agreement that 2 came at the end of the meeting. So, with those 3 two additions, two amendments, I'd move that 4 the minutes be approved as they appear in the 5 book. 6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any other 8 discussion? I will abstain from this vote since that was a meeting that I did not attend 9 10 on Region A. All in favor? 11 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 14 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 15 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 17 have it four to zero with the Chairman 18 abstaining. 19 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 20 And then the next set of minutes is for our 21 regular meeting on September 25, 2014. Those minutes too are in the book and I'd move their 22 23 approval as they appear with the usual

reservation for typographical and mechanical

Page 4 1 errors -- correction of typographical and mechanical errors. 2 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any discussion? 6 All in favor, aye. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 10 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 12 have it unanimously. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And finally 14 are the minutes of our regular meeting October 15 9, 2014. They too are in the book. And I 16 would move their approval with the usual 17 reservations as they appear there. 18 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Do we want 19 to make some note that Chairman Crosby 20 participated in the end of the meeting after we 21 had the Region A discussion? 22 It talks about him being recused, 23 but obviously, he joined us later in the 24 meeting.

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes, that's a 2 good catch. We should make that correction. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. I couldn't quite figure out. It looks like you adjourned 4 5 -- Oh, you made the motion. I think I was 6 back. So, whatever the moment at which I came 7 back to the meeting should be noted. I agree. 8 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Which was 9 right after we finished with Region A. 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right after 11 the recess. 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes, 11:10 AM 13 the approval of the minutes, you were there for 14 that. So, we'll make that correction there. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any other 16 discussion? With that amendment, all in favor, 17 aye. 18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 21 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 22 23 have it unanimously. We are then to item 24 number three, Administration, Executive

1 Director Day.

MR. DAY: Good morning, Chairman

Crosby and Commissioners. I'd like to begin

this morning, I'm positive you all recall, but

it just bears mentioning quickly is the

Commission has set up through its regulation

and through our team they have appropriate

expertise to set up a system to monitor the

casino projects and the Penn project.

I'd like to take a little bit of your time to introduce our project monitors for Regions A and B. So, I'll begin with the MGM project in Springfield. We've selected Pinck and Company.

Jennifer Pinck holds an MBA and she is president and founder --

17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Hold on a second.
18 Rob?

MR. DAY: Jennifer built her career from the ground up working her way through the construction industry to hold senior management positions for both of the region's recent mega projects, the Boston Harbor project and the Big Dig. Over the past 15 years, Pinck and Company

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

1 has managed over \$2 billion worth of projects 2 in some of the area's premier organizations. 3 The firm specializes in nonprofit, 4 institutional and public --5 We will try this again. Over the 6 past 15 years Pinck and Company has managed over \$2 billion worth of projects for some of 8 the area's premier organizations. The firm specializes in nonprofit, institutional and 9 10 public sector and is an advocate for 11 sustainable development helping to create 12 better buildings and stronger communities. 13 Pinck and Company also, of course, 14 serves as the Commission's monitor for the Penn 15 project. I should also note Pinck and Company supported the Commission's evaluation process 16 17 in your decisions about which licensee gets 18 licensed. 19 So, I'd like to refer to Jennifer to introduce her staff that's here today. 20 2.1 Jennifer. 22 MS. PINCK: Good morning, 23 Commissioners, nice to see you again. 24 thank you very much. You do know Pinck and

Company. I think we've been working with you now for about the past 15 months, but I would like to take the opportunity for your benefit as well as anybody who may be streaming and our audience here to say hello. Jennifer Pinck.

As Rick's said, we've been in business about 15 years. And would like also to let you know that as of yesterday we got our DBE certification, which is a nice additional credential that the company has and hopes to take advantage of.

We are ready to go to work in Springfield. You know us in Plainville. And briefly I will introduce to persons who are managing those projects on our behalf and for you. Mike Fitzgerald, New England native. I think you were born in Connecticut.

MR. FITZGERALD: Born in Massachusetts.

MS. PINCK: Massachusetts, he's a 22-year veteran of the Army Corps of Engineers with a degree in civil engineering and is a licensed PE in civil engineering. And he'll be assigned to the Springfield project for us.

1 And Dane Whigfall who you also know. 2 Dane is a California native who is enjoying New 3 England's Northeasters like we're having this 4 morning, who also has a civil engineering degree from UC Berkeley, and has been involved 5 6 in his career in many heavy civil highway projects on both direct management and the 8 oversight role. 9 So, we're looking forward to working 10 with you and MGM in Springfield, really seeing the transformation of that downtown and the 11 12 region. And continuing to work with Penn 13 14 who's been a great licensee. We've really 15 enjoyed that relationship, and bringing that 16 I know they're anxious to get online. 17 themselves up and running. And we'll see that 18 midway through next year. 19 And am going to excuse myself this 20 I unfortunately have to leave, but my morning. 21 two project managers here will certainly be able to continue their work. 22

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great, thank you,

23

24

Jennifer.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Jennifer. And I understand that Dane's vehicle had to learn how to swim itself this morning a little bit. We're glad you got here safely.

We've also selected PMA for the Wynn project in Everett. Mr. Stephen Rusteika is a managing director for PMA Consultants of the New England Region and will lead the PMA team providing oversight and OPM services for the Region A.

Steve holds a master of science and bachelor of science degrees in civil engineering from Northeastern University, is a member of the Northeastern University Civil and Environmental Engineering department advisory board.

In addition, Steve has significant experience in the areas of owner's project management and owner's representative. PMA Consultants is a nationally recognized consulting firm providing owner's project management, project controls and dispute avoidance. It was founded in 1971, and as well has 12 offices nationally.

With that I'll refer to Steve for 1 introduction of his staff. 2 3 MR. RUSTEIKA: Thank you very much 4 for selecting PMA for Region A. We are very excited about it. I brought my team with me. 5 6 Unfortunately, they are two rows behind me, but they will stand or wave their hand when I 8 mention them. 9 Chad Crittenden is going to be our 10 lead person and our senior project manager. Jason Lawson will be our full-time person on-11 12 site, working closely with the Wynn team. Halovalo (PHONETIC) who you know well will 13 14 continue in his role with project controls and 15 scheduling and planning. And Ken Lincare 16 (PHONETIC) is going to be an assistant to 17 myself and to Chad helping with anything that 18 we need along the way. So, we are very excited 19 about it and looking forward to getting 20 started. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great, thank you. 22 MR. DAY: Thank you, Steve. 23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I just 24 also note in the introduction, PMA is also a

minority business enterprise, just for the record.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Commissioner
Zuniga. If I might, one other thing this
morning I'd like to start just to make a note
of, we should also briefly recognize that the
Commission has conducted hearings led by
Commissioner Cameron on racing license
applications over the past few weeks.
Commissioner Stebbins was also able to attend
two of the hearings.

The hearings were in Brockton where the Commission considered the Brockton Agricultural Society and listened to public comment. It's a placeholder application for one day of live racing, thoroughbred racing which may be able to expand 15 days. Also the Middleborough Agricultural Society, it's a placeholder application for a similar period.

In Plainville, the Commission was also there. Springfield Gaming and Redevelopment, the application is to conduct 105 live harness racing live days, harness racing meet at the Plainridge course in

- Plainville, Massachusetts. The proposed meet will be conducted primarily on Mondays,
- 3 | Wednesdays and Thursdays in April.

4 And then in Boston, the New England Horsemen's Benevolent and Protective 5 6 Association has submitted an application for one day of live thoroughbred horseracing meet 8 at Suffolk Downs. It may be amended later 9 during the year in the application process. 10 Those applications have been posted and are 11 pending a 30-day comment period from the 12 Commission.

From that point, I don't know if

Commissioner Cameron or Commissioner Stebbins

had a comment at all that you wanted to make on
that process?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No. I think you covered it, Director Day. Thank you.

MR. DAY: Thank you very much. That does bring us to our main item under this topic area which is licensee Penn National Gaming's quarterly report. And Lance George, why don't you move right up to the microphones here.

Lance George and Emil, I forgot to include

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Turner Construction. That's item 3(b) in your
packet.

MR. RAUEN: Good morning. Nice to be here again today and talk to you about the progress we've made in the past quarter as we put in our quarterly report to you. With me is Emil Giordano, project executive from Turner Construction and Lance George, our property general manager.

I thought we'd just touch -- you've had report. I thought we'd just touch on some of the highlights and then certainly answer any questions you may have. But the third quarter has been a positive one for us. This particular report, we took the request from last time from you and put some photos in there, aerial photos, ground photos. I hope you found them useful.

Project progress has been good for the quarter. As pointed out in appendix two, the approved schedule from you remains on target for June 2015 opening. Design is complete in all areas. And all critical building-related permits are in hand to

complete the work.

In appendix four, we point out that the overall project budget remains at \$225 million. It exceeds the required minimum spend. And to date through 9/30, we have spent in cash \$91.1 million on the project.

We continue to work effectively with Mass. Gaming, your staff, Pinck, and working effectively on a variety of project matters.

We're happy to report that we've made progress on the off-site roadway improvements. We've received the MEPA section 61 findings and are pleased with the content of those. It meets all of our needs and those of the town of Plainville, from what I understand from them.

We have made significant filings with MassDOT, their District 5 and the Federal Highway Administration on design and permitting matters. And based on meetings we've had with them in the last couple of weeks, we feel we should be in possession of a permit sometime in the mid- to later November.

Adding all of that up, we think we're in good shape to complete the off-site

roadwork by the end of May 2015, which would tie in very nicely with our opening plans.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is that done under contract to you?

MR. RAUEN: It is. It's funded as part of our development project. The work is contracted to Turner. And they have -- I should have pointed this out. They have issued the designed, received bids. And this week we actually awarded the off-site roadway construction work.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: You awarded that contract this week?

MR. RAUEN: Yes. We awarded it to the same site contractor that has been doing all of the site work on the project. So, it worked out very well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great.

MR. RAUEN: In the past month, we have made tremendous progress. I know we've reported to you struggles with the off-sites before, but it's all come together very nicely.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good. And it

feels like everybody, all of the agencies, the
public agencies have their shoulder to the
wheel collaborating with you?

MR. RAUEN: They sure do. We're

MR. RAUEN: They sure do. We're very pleased right now, not just MassDOT but Federal Highway, tremendous cooperation.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good.

MR. RAUEN: And we think all is on target now.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good.

MR. RAUEN: Just some other highlights. In appendix number eight, we point out some improvements we've made to the on-site construction workforce diversity. We are on or above our goals for minorities and veterans. Still below goal on women, but we'll keep working at it.

On appendix nine, and we've had occasion to talk about this in recent weeks, as of September 30 we've made some tremendous progress on contracting with M-, W-, and VBE businesses. As of the end of September, our MBE direct construction contracting is at 14 percent versus a goal four. WBE contracting is

1 17 percent against a goal of seven. And VBE
2 contracting is at 14 percent against a goal of
3 three.
4 As of September 30 we've issued jus

As of September 30 we've issued just under \$57 million in direct construction subcontracts. \$25 Million or 44 percent of that number has been awarded to M-, W-, or VBE businesses.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great.

MR. RAUEN: Also in appendix nine, we point out that as of September 30 of those \$25 million in awards, \$2.9 million of those have been paid for work completed to date.

Those are the highlights as we saw them. Happy to answer any questions you might have.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: On the building, Jack, you are on target to close the envelope and be ready for winter conditions and progress smoothly I hope?

MR. RAUEN: We are.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Jack looking at the remaining amount of I think it's appendix eight, obviously there's still 133 million in remaining costs. How much of that

1 has been already contracted or accounted for 2 with identified vendors? Do you still see some 3 opportunities for participation by MBEs, WBEs 4 and VBEs? On the construction 5 MR. RAUEN: 6 side, we still have more to award. There's a lot of interior construction, drywall and 8 others that present some additional 9 opportunities. So, on the construction side 10 yes. There's also the fit-out and equipment, 11 which is a whole separate exercise covered by a 12 whole separate diversity plan. But we'll put 13 the same effort behind that that we've put on 14 this one. 15 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: The last. 16 time you were here, you reported on a couple of 17 categories for ventilation systems, which I 18 think one was going to a VBE, another big chunk 19 was going to a WBE. Are those accounted for in 20 these numbers someplace? 21 MR. RAUEN: Yes. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And these are

percents of dollars awarded, not percents of

the eventual total.

23

1 MR. RAUEN: It's percents of dollars 2 in direct construction contracts awarded. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Presently awarded. 4 MR. RAUEN: Right. We've awarded about \$57 million in direct construction 5 6 contracts. \$25 Million of that has been for 7 VBE, MBE or WBE enterprises. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. 9 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: One of the 10 big items is the gaming and operations 11 equipment. What percentage of that \$20 million 12 price tag is gaming equipment as opposed 13 operational equipment? It's got to be the 14 bigger chunk. 15 MR. RAUEN: In this particular 16 report, not too much of it. We are looking to 17 finance slot machines separately. So, they are 18 not shown as part of this. This would be more 19 other food and beverage equipment, operations 20 equipment. And those areas do present us some 21 opportunities for M-, W- and VBE, that slot 22 machines obviously don't. 23 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay, good. 24 Thank you.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: This is 2 actually a point that we've made to you in the 3 past, but any critical milestones going forward 4 that depend on our role, now or later we'd love to understand them to make sure we are not 5 6 delaying you or being in the way, if you will. 7 MR. RAUEN: I don't see anything 8 significant. I know there's issues out there 9 about the central system. But not knowing the 10 outcome of that, we are planning our 11 construction processes to as if it's going to 12 So, that's one item. happen. 13 Our focus now is just continuing 14 site work, continuing to get the building 15 closed and to focus on the garage and the 16 offices so that's turned over in February. 17 Right now, there's nothing from your side 18 that's causing us any real critical problems. 19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Great. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Anybody 21 else? 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: This is really 23 good report. It's terrific to see this 24 progress.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We really 2 appreciate the attention to the diversity efforts, much noted. 3 4 MR. RAUEN: Our pleasure. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else from 6 your report? 7 MR. DAY: That's it for me. That. 8 brings us to our Ombudsman and the two license 9 designee reports, Wynn and MGM. John? 10 MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you, Director 11 Day. Mr. Chairman, as you know, we have 12 monthly reports from our license designees. 13 First up today will be MGM. I'm going to ask 14 Mike Mathis and his team to come to the front 15 of the room. Mike Mathis will introduce the rest of his team. 16 17 Thank you, John. MR. MATHIS: Thank 18 you, Commissioners for allowing us to present 19 I think this is our fourth monthly 20 update following the award of the agreement for 21 a license. 22 And the theme for today is workforce 23 development. And I think that's really 24 appropriate. This, as you know, is a jobs bill

more than anything else. And there's been a lot of conversation in the public about jobs.

We're really excited. As you know, we bring a tremendous amount of innovation to our project design as well as our program. And I think we want to show today the innovation we bring to workforce development.

Before I hand it off to my colleagues, I wanted to introduce a few people in the audience today. Bill Messner, President of Holyoke Community College, Bob Griffin who is a director at HCC, Jeff Hayden in charge of community development as well as a couple of gentlemen that aren't here today, two of our partners on the workforce development side are with STCC and that is Bob LePage who's part of the Massachusetts Casino Career Training Institute as well as Ira Rubenzahl who is the president.

With that let me hand it off to Dave
Cruise who's been our partner on the Hampden
Regional Employment Board side.

MR. CRUISE: Thank you, Mike. Good morning, Commissioners. I wanted to take a few

minutes this morning as part of our
presentation to share some data with you that
as Mike said we think are important to
understand in relation to the excitement we
have around the workforce needs in Hampden
County, in particular in the host community of
Springfield.

This data is taken from the American Community Survey in 2012. And I've got some updated figures that were just released this week that I think will be helpful as well.

In 2012, in Hampden County, which has a population of approximately 460,000 residents, we had an unemployment rate of 11 percent. If you look at the graphic, you'll see particularly in that critical age of 25 to 44 that unemployment rate two years ago was 10.2 percent. And in the 45 to 54 range, you see it dropping significantly. But we think that 25 to 44 range is particularly an area where we are looking in terms of the workforce for the casino.

I want to also share some information with you that was just released

1 this week by the Massachusetts Office of Labor 2 and Workforce Development, particularly with 3 respect to the region and to the host community 4 of Springfield. In Hampden County today, we have a workforce of approximately 224,000. And 5 6 in that workforce employed are 206,000, which leaves approximately 18,000 individuals or 8 eight percent of that labor force participation rate that is still not attached to the 9 10 workforce. And the unemployment rate as you 11 know in the Commonwealth currently sits at 6.2 12 percent. In the host city in Springfield in 13 14 the month of September, we have a workforce 15 participation of approximately 66,000 16 individuals. And of that number, 6000 of them 17 currently remain unemployed, which is a 18 percentage of 10.2 percent. 19 And again a year ago, September 20 2013, that rate was 11.1 percent. For the 21 first nine months of this year, we've been 22 fluctuating between 10.9 percent and last 23 month's figure of 10.2 percent. We are 24 stubbornly stuck in that 10.2 to 10.9 range.

And again, I said across the state the unemployment rate remains at 6.2 percent

And of the cities in the

Commonwealth with the highest percentage of
unemployment, again, Springfield ranks number
five. You have Lawrence, New Bedford, Fall
River, Gosnold and then Springfield, and right
behind Springfield at 10 percent again is the
city of Holyoke. Again, two of the critical
gateway cities in Hampden County, core cities
that are critical to the rebirth of this
community.

So, I wanted to share that data with you a little bit just to give you a little sense of where we stand right now this morning in that area.

The second little graphic that I want to show you that I think is important is to take a look at the rich diversity that we have in Hampden, and in particular in our two gateway cities and in particular in the host community of Springfield.

You can see from the graphic, the population again in Hampden County is very,

very rich. And particularly, as I said, in the two gateway cities and the host community, we have a very rich population of Hispanic and Latino, African-American, Asian. And we think the diversity of that workforce and that labor force is going to be critical again to the work that we're looking at doing going forward.

And the third and the last graphic that I want to share with you again is a little bit about the educational attainment levels here in the area. You can again see in the gateway cities of Springfield and Holyoke, we have a high school graduation rate in June of 2013 between 54 and 52 percent. We have a long way to go to catch up not only with the county as a whole, but with the state in general. And that's something we are working very, very hard at.

You can also see the number of residents age 25 and over without a high school diploma during the time period of 2008 to 2012. Again, that figure is stubbornly stuck in those areas. We are working hard to try to figure out ways to respond to that.

1 And also see the small percentage of individuals with a bachelor's degree. And that 2 3 ranges again a little bit below 20 percent of 4 the 18 and 19 percent of the residents of Hampden County, in particular the two larger 5 6 cities. Springfield in particular again stubbornly stuck in that area. And you look at 8 the number of young people again ages 16 to 19 9 struggling to be attached to the workforce, 10 those numbers are significant. 11 So, I wanted to just share a little 12 bit of this data with you. My colleague Laura 13 Lee that I'm going to introduce in a minute will talk a little bit more in detail about 14 15 that. But I wanted to just share that data 16 with you just as a lead-in again to our 17 presentation. 18 So, let me introduce Laura Lee who 19 is a Vice President of Regional Operations for 20 MGM Resorts International. 21 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: David, I 22 have a quick question. Around the unemployment 23 figures there is obviously the national story

around the unemployment rates are not

accurately reflecting the real unemployment rate.

MR. CRUISE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: One of the other key pieces of the legislation was talking about the underemployed.

MR. CRUISE: Right.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: How do you distinguish out the underemployed in these numbers or can you?

MR. CRUISE: I think the data that we have here does not really call out or pull out the number of underemployed. But I can tell you from the work that we do at the Regional Employment Board of Hampden County, there's a significant amount of young folks and folks in general that are in what we describe as the marginal labor market.

They may be working part-time. They even may be working full-time at wages just above minimum wage, hardly enough to sustain a family. But there's a huge pool of underemployed individuals. We see them all of the time at our two career centers. They're a

1 significant part of the population that we 2 serve in both of those centers. And even 3 though they're not counted in that data, if 4 they were counted in that data, those numbers would be skewed even higher. 5 6 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thanks. 7 MS. LEE: Good morning, 8 Commissioners. One thing I wanted to start off with is kind of telling you a little bit about 9 10 my career history. 11 We're an entertainment company. Ιf 12 we can't make you chuckle then we haven't done 13 our job. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Your whole team is 15 already chuckling. I can't wait to hear this 16 story. 17 MS. LEE: I actually opened the 18 Mirage back in 1989 as a VIP services 19 attendant, which is along the lines of a front desk clerk. With that, I worked my way up 20 21 opening up Treasure Island in human resources, 22 decided I wanted to get back to my passion. 23 And for purposes of this meeting, I actually 24 went back and counted that since 1989 up until

my most recent position of senior vice president, I've been promoted 10 times within MGM Resorts within 25 years. So, that's just a little bit about me.

I know that you've had the opportunity to meet Kelley Tucky and she's had a similar background as well. Again, I just want to reiterate that we are committed to providing a diverse workforce for MGM Springfield.

Next slide, we just wanted to bring to everyone's attention a little bit about our career opportunities timeline. We believe that we will have construction up and going on Q2 of 2015 with approximately 1000 construction workers. Our peak will be Q2 of 2016 Q3 with approximately 2000 construction workers.

And as we are winding down construction and beginning to gear up for operations of the hotel, we'll begin our hiring approximately five to six months prior to the opening of MGM Springfield. We just have some data here showing -- obviously we'll have a smaller team on board between now and six

months out. But we'll start hiring 200,
ramping up about two months out where we will
employ or hire 1140 and then have our 3000
right around opening. And again, as stated we
are committed to hiring 35 percent from the
Springfield area and 90 percent from the
Western Massachusetts area.

This is just a high-level overview of the areas we would be looking hire such as casino, food and beverage are two of the largest, and then general and administrative that's usually our back of the house finance, HR, warehouse, those sorts of positions.

And as Dave pointed out, these are the demographics for the MGM workforce profile. We are a majority minority company and almost 50-50 male-female. And we feel that Western Massachusetts, they fit in well with our diversity goals and commitment.

At MGM Resorts we have a people philosophy that we are committed to engaging, investing in and inspiring our employees each and every day. And I'm going to spend a few moments now just to let you know how we are

committed to do the same with the potential applicants for MGM Springfield.

I am not going to go through our entire mass hiring plan. This slide I just want to point out that we've already started out workforce development, meeting with our partners at STCC, Holyoke working with Mr. Cruise to begin developing our workforce development plan.

The next slide will show, and I think it's important, that we don't see workforce development ending when MGM Springfield opens. We feel it will continue. We'll continue to work with our partners so that our employees have the ability to continue uplifting their education, perhaps looking at different promotional opportunities if they are interested.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me, Laura. What is mass orientation at the bottom of that slide?

MS. LEE: Typically, when you're opening a property, you do large orientations in your convention area. So, there might be

three or 400 attendees. And we have a variety 1 2 of sessions. And we orient them to MGM 3 Springfield. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Mass means lots not Massachusetts? 5 6 MS. LEE: A lot, yes, not 7 Massachusetts. That continues to be an 8 MR. MATHIS: issue, by the way. In our internal documents 9 10 we continue to use mass in that context and 11 it's creating a little bit of confusion. So, 12 we've got to come up with a synonym for that. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: What's the 14 reference to mother hen? 15 MS. LEE: They're laughing in the What we like to do is we may hire 16 back. 17 someone nine months out and we won't start them 18 until maybe four months out, three months out. 19 So, we like to stay in contact with them. 20 So, we'll send them notes, send them 21 letters, emails saying we're excited that you 22 are starting. Can't wait for you to begin with 23 MGM Springfield. So, just keeping them engaged

and interested in the project.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Laura, in the previous slide you talk about -- fill us in a little bit more on the launch, the onboarding website.

MS. LEE: Yes. What we will end up doing, our system now is when you start with the company we send you a link in that you will be able to do your pre-employment paperwork on that such as some of your I-9 paperwork, emergency contact, all of that. So, when you come in we already have a lot of that done.

Now I would like to just take a few minutes to walk through the different steps of our kind of workforce development plan. So, how will we engage? Like I stated before, we have already begun working with our various community partners, nonprofit organizations, faith-based organizations. And we plan to continue that relationship beyond the opening of the property.

We'll work through the traditional channels of workforce development as well as look for new ways to uplift and educate the region. A good example is we will start a

1 boots to business program. That will be an 2 ongoing program. But prior to MGM Springfield, 3 we will work to bring -- hire nine to 10 4 veterans. Have them come out to Las Vegas 5 approximately nine months to a year prior to 6 opening. They may be say in casino, learn how operations works within MGM Resorts. And then 8 their commitment is they will go back to MGM 9 Springfield in a supervisory role.

And resources, this is just a short list of all of our partners. And we continue to meet and grow that list of partners. And I think on your printout it didn't turn out.

And what's important is community outreach. We will have your traditional websites, a career center where applicants can call in, ask questions. But I think, and Dave talks to some of the unemployment rates, underemployed and then there's those that aren't even reported because they've just given up. The transportation becomes difficult for many of these residents.

And we don't necessarily have the expectation that they're all going to drive to

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

our career center. So, one of our goals is to
do a lot of community outreach. Once we have
our construction plan, go out to church
meetings, organizational meetings and so forth
and talk to them about how they can begin
developing. If they have a certain career that
they'd like or we're hiring for construction.
Here's the process if you are interested.

And we will also have job readiness sessions once we get a little closer to opening where we'll go out into the community. And the HR team will do how to interview, how to write a resume, just those basic skills that a lot of times are lacking so that they are ready once they interview at MGM Springfield, they're already ahead of the game, how to dress that sort of thing.

And we will invest in our employees.

And I'd like to take a moment now to introduce the two gentlemen to the right. They are with a company that we've contracted with called SkillSmart. We found SkillSmart and utilized them up in National Harbor, our project there during a recent career showcase that we had

1 about three months ago.

And last week, we also utilized them at the MGM Springfield career showcase. I have Mike Knapp seated right next to me. He's the CEO of SkillSmart and also a former president of the County Council of Montgomery County, Maryland.

Next to him is Jason Green. He's the Vice President of Business Development. He was also associate White House Counsel to President Obama. And through their public careers, they worked together. And once they entered the private sector, they realized the importance of aligning both public and the private sectors to create a stronger workforce in the communities in which we work and live. So, I'll go ahead and turn it over to Mike.

MR. KNAPP: Thank you, Laura. Good morning, Commissioners. It's a pleasure to be with you.

When Jason and I left our previous jobs, we had a lot of conversations about challenges that were out there. And one that really struck us was or continues to strike us

was the types of reports that we'll see where the number of companies that were out there that were seeking employees and yet the stubborn unemployment rates continue to persist.

As we did a lot of research, we recognize that the skills gap that gap between the skills employers are looking for and the skills that employees or jobseekers tend to possess is real and very tangible. So, knowing that we really started to explore the different types of things that we could do to better align the employer, the jobseeker and education providers.

So, we recognize that if we could pull together a platform that could identify -- help employers to better identify the skills that they're looking for and increase that level of transparency then it would also allow jobseekers literally to better identify the skills that they possess. And also think about where they may have acquired those skills.

We tend to think about skills coming from going to high school, going to college and

1 | that's how we're prepared for the workforce.

2 And yet oftentimes we acquire skills in many

3 different places, whether it's working in our

4 church group and volunteering, heading up Boy

5 Scouts, coaching, learning through classroom

6 activities or through the job.

So, we wanted to make sure that we could help those employees or jobseekers more holistically present the skills that they've acquired over the lifetime of activities that they've undertaken. So, that really became the genesis for what we put together was SkillSmart. Because if we could do those two pieces, then we would also give the education providers a better sense of the types of things that they needed to help their students to acquire to be able to be effective in the workforce.

So, with that, we identified the mission to really begin to transform lives by connecting those elements. So, as Laura had indicated, we worked last week with them. We were previously in National Harbor. We worked last week at the showcase in Springfield. And

here are a couple of pictures of folks who were actually inputting their information into our computers.

What typically happened last week was there was about a 20-minute orientation. And then each of the individuals was allowed to basically walk through the Hall of Fame and get familiarized with the types of positions, and talk to MGM employees in how they did their jobs and what those jobs entailed.

And then they would come over to talk to us. And we would then put them with a computer. And they would begin to go through the platform and identify just some basic background information about themselves and of the jobs that were there, the types of the ones that generated their interest and where they may have had some experience.

And you can see on the slide in front of you that here is kind of the top five positions that presented themselves. There were 507 people who registered. We had 484 of them actually get to a computer and provide their information. So, the high levels of

interest were front desk clerks, special events rep., attendant for front services, security officer and surveillance operators.

So, it gives a sense of just where people think their skills match up or just where their areas of interest are. And you can see the levels of those who identified that they have experience and those in those five areas.

What I want to do though is now give you a sense of what were they looking as they were sitting at the computer. What we have is a platform that, as I indicated, allows the jobseeker to identify the skills that they've acquired. They filled out a profile identifying those activities, how they got the skills, how they've used them.

Then we have the employer identify the skills they have associated with each position. Once we have those in, then the jobseeker can then run a search against the database and see where their skills match up against the jobs that are in that database.

And in the example you see in front

of you, this individual scored very well on a scale of 0 to 100 in the utility porter and custodian positions. So, they know that that is something they're well-suited for and they want to apply for.

But perhaps they really want to be a poker dealer. And if you look here, clearly their skill requires some more building. So, in that instance, we allow them to then click on that position. It gets them -- identifies the prerequisites, the job description, the various skills associated with that position. Then they can see where they have strengths and where they have areas where they are going to need further opportunity for growth. So, for example in this instance, mathematics is where this particular individual needs some more assistance.

So, we highlight that. They click on the improve my skills. And what it takes them to is the information or the activity within their community that will allow them to acquire that skill.

In this instance, it's a math course

at STCC. It could well me a math course at any other community colleges or any other training providers that could provide the level of information or skills that are required to be successful in some of the things that MGM is looking for.

This becomes a real platform that you can bring lots of your community partners in and make sure that they can participate in helping to train up the local workforce. And it's not just necessarily locally, but could also tie into the Commonwealth's career 101 program through the One-Stop Centers and use it that way as well. So, that gives you a sense of how --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me. Can people access this at times other than your job fairs? Is this something you can access remotely?

MR. KNAPP: Yes, and that's the point. So, this would be available to the community to be able to access at any time.

So, they could do it remotely if they're home.

They could also work with, if they're working

with a community service provider or social service provider, they may have terminals or computers there.

We could even do -- And Laura will reference this in a little bit. -- but even a train the trainer program where we could help bring people up to speed so that they could actually help individuals work their way through and build their profiles. So, it's not just come to a job fair or a job showcase and participate in it, but you can access it throughout the community.

MR. MATHIS: Mr. Chairman, if I could just talk about why we're so excited about this tool. In this day and age of mobility mobile devices, I think the power of this tool is that for example when we have new job postings, we can send an alert to any applicant who signed up through this program to let them know that that position is now available.

And as we backload those positions, working with HCC, we're working with STCC, working with new career training institute, we

can post new training programs.

So, I think the power of this tool takes us out of the old days of submitting a resume and being told that you're not qualified and that being the end of the conversation until someone looks at another classified ad. This is a really powerful tool and we're really excited about it. And you'll see some more of the functionality of it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. The key obviously is making people know it's there. Promoting it enough, having it branded somehow or another and having it out there enough so that people know about it.

MS. LEE: If I may, one of our -- I was going to address this after, but our long-term goal, and we've already been talking with our community partners even places such as the Puerto Rican Cultural Center already hit Mike up for preopening budget that if they need a computer, they will get a computer. Then Mike and Jason their team would come and train them. So, it's accessible at all of these either nonprofit, community partners and so forth.

So, when they're working with their candidates that they'll be able to just help them right there as well. So, it'll be very accessible in the community.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great.

MR. KNAPP: So, just want to do a little bit more of the information we gleaned from the showcase from last week. In addition to that information that individuals have identified and positions that they're interested in, you can also go back through and see where they may or may not be as interested but have levels of experience.

So, it gives you a sense of the type of foundational skills that the people in the community may have that you can build on. Or it gives the information back to MGM to think about positions that may be similar to where people have skills but may not be exactly what people have identified so that you can steer people in the right direction, and round out their training so that they are better suited for other positions within the organization.

Here's the educational demographics

1 that we found from the group that attended last 2 week. Actually, it was a very educated 3 population that came in. Twenty-six percent 4 were high-school graduates, 22 percent had a 5 bachelor's degree, 28 percent had some college 6 and even 10 percent had master's degrees, which is interesting because that tends to a little 8 bit counter to the data that was presented 9 earlier.

And that could present us a couple of different things. It may be what we're seeing is an overrepresentation of certain populations. Or perhaps even people are overstating what they may have in a very generic way because they think that that's what they need to show that they're qualified for the positions.

And we may -- provide us an opportunity to educate the community that you don't necessarily need to do that because we're going to show you the pathway to get the skills that you need for the positions within the MGM community.

MR. MATHIS: If I can, I want to

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

pause on that for a moment, because I think the data is critical. And just this first phase and some of things we're learning based on a sample of 490 I think is pretty telling.

By the way, that tiny little slice that doesn't have an identifier, I filled it out. Jason Green filled it out. And it turned out there were two individuals with JDs that were interested in positions. So, we thought that was a bad sample. And we took that out.

If you look at this pie chart what it will tell you is that under the some high school that we've got a very highly educated applicant group. And that GED education, for example, isn't quite a priority. That's not the case. You saw David Cruise's presentation. We've got a 55 percent high school graduation rate, a 45 percent high school dropout rate.

And we don't believe we'll be successful unless we bring that group of individuals, many of which are Springfield residents, into the workforce. What we did is when I looked at that data, I questioned it.

And I reached out to some of our community

partners that brought applicants to that job
fair.

We know of at least 150 or so applicants that are immigrant workers, immigrant folks that have not entered into a GED program because they haven't been aware of it or they are in a queue for a GED program. And for whatever reason, they didn't indicate that in this response. And I think it's because they thought they needed to over represent their qualifications in order to get into our system.

The takeaway for me and our team is we need to go out to that population in the next round and tell them that's not a liability in terms of being an attractive candidate.

That's actually an asset. And that's something that we want to do and work with you folks on.

So, a lot of takeaways and that's an important one for us. And we will continue to monitor these metrics and modify our strategy and our program there.

23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's really 24 great. I really appreciate your looking

1 through the numbers and (A) trying to really 2 understand what's out there, but (B) 3 remembering who the hard to employ audience is 4 and that was a legislative mandate. 5 So, that's really to go the extra 6 mile to try to make that happen, which is 7 great. Jill, I hope you're hearing some of 8 these hints. These are really good. 9 MR. KNAPP: So, here's just the 10 employment status of those people who showed up 11 last week. Forty-three percent employed, 41 12 percent are out of work and looking. 13 clearly reflective of what we're seeing in the 14 community and gives us a good cross-section of 15 who we know we need to make sure we are 16 reaching out to. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What was the 18 residents make up of that four hundred and 19 something? 20 MR. MATHIS: That's coming. 21 MR. KNAPP: Nice job, thank you, Mr. 22 I appreciate that. And our final Chairman. 23 slide really begins to show where people are 24 coming from.

So, you can see that clearly coming from Springfield, from Holyoke although interestingly and you couldn't get it all on one screen, people came from as far as Boston.

We had four or five people that came from this community to come out and visit the job showcase in Springfield.

So, you're seeing -- The nice thing about this is you get to see how the outreach has worked. If there have been specific marketing campaigns or outreach activities with specific groups, you can see did that work? Did we get the yield from those particular communities and if so, great. We know that that's working.

And if we didn't and we saw

communities underrepresented then we know we

have got to begin to do a lot more work in

those communities to make sure people know to

participate or to identify other partners

within those communities to make sure that

we're helping them reach their local

populations.

So, it gives a good sense. You can

1 also split it out in different pieces and begin 2 to look at the populations in who is coming 3 from where and which skills they possess. So, 4 it's just a matter of how you want to begin to 5 slice the data. 6 COMMISSIONER STEBBSIN: Is this zip 7 code based? 8 MR. KNAPP: Yes. So, with that I'll 9 turn it back over to Laura. 10 MS. LEE: Just one thing I think 11 Mike did talk about. There's a lot of skills 12 that are transferable skills. Just because you 13 had one job, you may have skills that allow you 14 to do another job. That's what's great about 15 this program and what we like, because it 16 allows us to work with those candidates. 17 Retail cashier, okay, you don't want to be a 18 retail cashier anymore but you want to be front 19 desk, great. You have these transferable 20 skills. And you could learn how to work and 21 manage the front desk. 22 Then the next slide, this is just 23 really our high-level plan to get the community 24 ready for our positions. One thing I wanted to

address is our overarching mission is to allow smaller companies to utilize the tool without charge to backfill their positions.

We plan to go back to the Greater

Springfield Chamber and other regional chambers and allow them to list their positions perhaps for a year -- We're still working our those details. -- because we know that there's a lot of small businesses in the Springfield area. And we wouldn't want to take the best food server maybe from the pizza place and have them work at Springfield and have that small employer hurt. So, that way they will be able to draw from these sources as well.

Additionally, we feel this kind of complements what Massachusetts has put in place. Where we will put in there if they need the Careers 101 course and push them to that. Then after they do their remediation to note that in that system.

Then also at the end, perhaps they're not selected at MGM Springfield or one of the smaller companies, we will push them to Job Quest and the One-Stops and say although

you didn't get accepted here there are other opportunities within the area.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I want to stop for a minute, because this is key and a tremendous asset for the region.

I think all of us agree that the job opportunities is kind of a huge hook. It's a marketing draw for people to step out and say I want to pursue a career but for those with the skills don't match up with this is a fantastic way to use that information, coming in and directing them off to other careers and services and opportunities.

I know it's something that the community college folks have been talking about since the early days of the Commission. So, it's great you're making this tool available out to the rest of the region.

MS. LEE: Thank you. And we like it because it allows us to be proactive as well. Really we're getting towards the end. You heard me talk about my background, Kelley's background. But I have message from one of our employees, Gabby, who is the Director for Food

and Beverage at New York New York Resort and Casino. She would like to tell you a little bit about the opportunities MGM Resorts has given her.

(Video is played)

MR. MATHIS: If I can make some closing comments, especially for our friends from Western Mass. who trekked out this morning to be part of this. This is particularly for Bill Messner, President of HCC but also for David as well and the rest of our group. When it comes to employment, we recognize that the goal of the Gaming Act is not only jobs but quality jobs, and we believe net job growth.

So, the power of this tool is to make sure that we can identify real-time what kind of applicants we're getting. You saw a pie chart that talked about employed/unemployed. That's something I asked Mike and Jason to build into their profile because we didn't want to just get employed applicants who are trying to get better job.

That's important.

We also want to make sure that we were getting unemployed folks that are going to be entering into the market. At the same time, we're launching this project across the whole corporation. And I think something that Laura touched on is we want to make this product available to small businesses that wouldn't be able to invest in a product like this.

So, why are we starting 18 to 24 months earlier than we're going to make our first hires is because we're going to reach out to the small businesses. And as we get applicants who would be a great fit but maybe would be a great fit with a little bit of training, on-the-job training, we can kick those individuals off to some of the small businesses that are also looking for positions and backfill positions along with MGM Springfield.

So, it's a wonderful tool.

Incredibly excited about it. And I think it will allow us to achieve our goals. We have goals to our surrounding communities to make

1 sure that the jobs come from all around the 2 communities. We have goals related to 3 ethnicity, employed, unemployed. And this is a 4 tool that will allow us to manage those 5 expectations and achieve those results. 6 Last thing I'll say to you is the 7 impact of what we're trying to do collectively, 8 meaning the Commission and our project really came home to me last week at our career 9 10 showcase. 11 We had 500 individuals show up. 12 Many of them had been unemployed for five 13 months, a year, two years. They recognize that 14 these positions wouldn't be available for 18 15 months to 24 months. But they were there 16 because they desperately want these 17 opportunities. 18 So, it's incredibly rewarding. 19 I think we should collectively be proud about 20 what we're trying to do here. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great 22 stuff, Mike. This is a complicated datadriven. You need a lot of input, a lot of 23 24 training to make this thing work. It's great.

1 It's very exciting. 2 But who actually will be running it 3 on a day-to-day basis? Who is responsible for 4 making sure that the data is really up to date that you're doing the outreach to the small 5 6 businesses? That the small businesses know what they're doing that whole bit? I think Laura and I can 8 MR. MATHIS: 9 tag team that response. We're in a delicate 10 spot, because we haven't finalized our contract 11 with SkillSmart. So, I think we're in trouble. 12 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Sorry we 13 talked about how great they were. 14 MR. MATHIS: There's a bunch of 15 corporate lawyers back in Las Vegas that are 16 going to kill about this presentation. 17 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: How about we 18 close the deal right here. 19 MR. KNAPP: Keep talking though. 20 really like this. 21 MR. MATHIS: Let me hand it off to 22 Laura about our next steps and how we're going

MS. LEE: Thank you. We will

23

24

to roll this out.

actually have a director of workforce

development on the MGM Springfield team. That

will be one of their key jobs.

Our next steps are to circle back with the community college, all of the different nonprofit organizations and really dive into their curriculums, looking at our job descriptions and putting together that match. What we showed you at STCC was just kind of a quick example of how it'll work. So, we plan to do that maybe in the next maybe three to five months. Then we feel that we'll be ready to go out and do our community outreach.

But as I stated, it will be an ongoing position. So, that person will continue to work with SkillSmart, getting the data uploaded, working with the community, keeping updated as to what new classes.

Or if we have a skills gap, we'll be able to go out to STCC or Holyoke and say we really need help with this. Do you think you could create a curriculum for us.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Could I just reinforce this, Commissioner? You all have

1 certainly indicated a seriousness about this 2 which we note and appreciate. But just to 3 reiterate, this is one of those things is like 4 a great website. You design a fabulous website 5 and every day that goes by it's less good 6 because you don't keep it up to date. So, having the commitment to put the 8 bodies behind this so it can really do what it's meant to do is obviously really crucial. 9 10 MR. MATHIS: We are making that commitment today. 11 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I don't doubt 13 that. 14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I just 15 wanted to add as a reminder as you look down 16 the rest of our agenda, and certainly don't 17 expect you to stick around through this 18 afternoon, to go back and watch this Webcast 19 because we have some folks coming in to talk 20 about the diversity on the construction side of 21 things. 22 And getting some helpful ideas, and 23 suggestions, best practices of encouraging

minorities and women to enter the construction

workforce. I know Dave Wallace from Labor and
Workforce Development is here because he is
focused on the apprentice need which we've
talked about in the past as a great way to
encourage more minorities and women and veteran
to get into the workforce on the construction
side.

And it's a different issue depending on where you are in Massachusetts. I know the Springfield project is going to have unique challenges, probably different than the project in Everett. But keep focused on that goal as well. This is encouraging.

MR. MATHIS: I appreciate that comment. I met Dave earlier with Jill and somebody that we want to talk to.

Sometimes I think it seems

counterintuitive that we're so focused on

workforce development, which are the

operational jobs in three years, and don't

spend as much time with you on the construction

side. Part of the reason for that is we are

tying that to the selection of our general

contractor.

1 So, those conversations are ongoing. 2 But they are obviously a critical player in 3 that conversation. We will come back to you 4 once that selection is made. We expect to make 5 it in the next two to three months. And we'll 6 roll out the same type of program to ensure to you that we're going to achieve the same type 8 of goals that we are doing on the workforce 9 development side. 10 So, very focused on it and understand the importance of making sure that 11 12 similar to the permanent jobs that we have, 13 local residents getting construction jobs, not 14 just pulling it from the East which is probably

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It's good to hear. Thanks, Mike.

easier way to do it. So, we'll be back to you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I just want to say we're constantly prodding and pushing and that's our job. But this is a good tool. It's an excellent tool. But the philosophy in back of its use I think is really commendable.

The idea we're going to use this, and here is why the lead time, is we're going

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to train people, identify their skills,

identify their aspirations, help them get the

training, move them into the positions in a

company that has demonstrated its ability to

promote from within, and continue to do that.

And at that same time use this same tool to backfill the jobs that are coming out of other places. This is a win-win deal for everybody. And it once again is, for me at least as one Commissioner, demonstrating the commitment that you have not only to meeting our expectations but in many cases to exceed them.

I sound like a cheerleader all of the time, but there's a lot to cheer about here. And I think this is really a remarkable commitment to the basic and fundamental goals of the statute. And I'm delighted to see this presentation here today as one Commissioner.

MR. MATHIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I also think it looks like a fabulous tool, really getting people the skills and having them identify what they need and where they can go to get it,

1 which is even a bigger issue.

So, you've been doing this for about two years?

MR. KNAPP: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And so are there already some lessons learned for some places that you've started to use this program?

MR. KNAPP: Yes. And the thing we're finding is that every time we do it someplace else, there are more lessons to be learned.

So, it covers the gambit. One of the nice things, and I think to your comments Commissioners is about MGM, MGM is one of the organizations that we've discovered has a better handle on the skills required for its employees than other organizations.

We've talked to many other large companies with names that you would all recognize who we've approached and said what do you think about deploying this kind of a strategy. And they have struggled because they have recognized that they don't necessarily know the skills that they have internal to

1 their current employees.

So, that's one of the things. So, I just want to recognize that that MGM I think is forward thinking not just in regard to the community but also in their workforce in general.

We are learning that the nice thing about our platform is that it can be deployed in partnership with a lot of people. We've also found a couple of our early conversations were such that people would see this as a competitive element. And really, it's a way to bring together the employer, the jobseeker and the community service provider, education provider in way that people can connect that they can't currently in really any other platform.

It's hard to your point, Mr.

Chairman, as it relates to kind of engaging and make sure the tool is updated. One of the things we wanted to create was a dynamic platform because we recognize in talking to other people that if you do it once and everybody inputs all of the data and it goes

away or it hasn't been updated, within a month it's out of date and it isn't a useful tool.

So, our platform is a dynamic platform. So, as new positions come in and identifies additional skills that may have not already been put into the system, so you can flag that.

So, the education providers can see wait a minute, they're requiring an additional capacity that wasn't there before. We need to make sure our curriculum now reflects that so that we can continue to have that be something that is relevant throughout the time that it is being used. Because you're right, if it's never updated then it goes away despite what all best intentions may be.

And we've also found the community providers can really leverage this to identify jobseekers who may require additional efforts transportation, childcare that they can help track those jobseekers through this kind of a platform, and see when they're having challenges or where some of the difficulties may be and really provide those extra support

services.

They can see the progress that their community members may be having or not making and be able to make sure that the flag goes up and ask the questions.

So, we learn a lot with kind of every new deployment but we're very excited about this because it's a much more holistic approach because it can take place within an entire community. And we've seen it in most of the other places we've worked.

MR. MATHIS: And I'll just make one more final comment. We are really are all in this together. For Bob DeSalvio, we don't have these guys under an exclusivity. So, I'd be happy to share some of the upfront costs if they'd be interesting in joining.

We're really excited. We really appreciate the comments. And I think

Massachusetts has raised the bar with the 
Gaming Act and what you've asked of us. And we 
continue to meet it and exceed it. And it's 
driving innovation within our own company.

So, I thank you for the high

standard that you've raised throughout this process and very proud to continue to deliver on that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very much. We are going to take a quick break and come back for our next report in five or 10 minutes.

(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are ready to reconvene meeting 137. And I think we will go right back to Ombudsman Ziemba. We are going to change the schedule a little bit. We are running ahead of schedule. And when we finish with Ombudsman Ziemba, we are going to move to the research and problem gambling agenda item and have lunch after that.

MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you very much,
Mr. Chairman. Today we are joined by Wynn MA,
LLC for their first report since being
designated as the designated licensee a little
over a month today.

We are joined by Robert DeSalvio,

- 1 | Senior Vice President of Development for Wynn.
- 2 And Jacqui Krum, Senior Vice President and
- 3 General Counsel for Wynn. Thank you Bob and
- 4 Jacqui.
- 5 MR. DESALVIO: Thanks John and good
- 6 morning, Commissioners. It's great to have
- 7 | Jacqui with me here with me again from Las
- 8 Vegas. We are very happy really to present our
- 9 first update.
- 10 I would say that the key theme of
- 11 | the update is significant amount of outreach
- 12 | work that we've been doing since we last spoke
- 13 | with you folks.
- 14 The first topic that we wanted to
- 15 cover is in the building and site design front.
- 16 The Commission had asked that we reconsider
- 17 | looking at the actual design of the hotel tower
- 18 | in particular. And I can tell you that serious
- 19 work is being done on that front.
- 20 I was in Las Vegas for the last
- 21 | couple of weeks working alongside with Mr. Wynn
- 22 and the architecture and interior design team.
- 23 And they have some terrific ideas that we'll be
- 24 | prepared to show you in a little bit. They

want to conclude the work that they've been working on.

And quite honestly, it's not just the hotel tower. Mr. Wynn really takes very seriously the entire arrival sequence and what the guests see as they enter the property. And for those of you that might have been at G2E or heard his keynote address, he spent some time, quite a bit of time talking about the Massachusetts project and the work that he has done already in terms of making this a very spectacular entry sequence, and trying to make sure every aspect of that building is planned out in a way that will be very well presented.

So, that work is underway. We took your direction seriously. And we're looking forward to presenting that at a later date.

The next items that we've been working on very extensively is the preparation of the final environmental report, what's known as the SFEIR. That is a document that required us to take a look at some of the -- mainly just the transportation aspects of our program and get back with DCR, with DOT, with the

communities that surround us and make sure that we've covered all of our bases as it relates to transportation.

I will tell you that work is going on very aggressively. Our team is meeting with the DOT and others at least a couple of times a week. So, this is an extremely active process. I can tell you also that it's going very well.

And without going into all details, I will just give you a couple of examples. We are looking in the Phase 1 Sullivan Square, the DOT had some great suggestions about one of the intersections. It was one that we had not resignalized. We talked about some realignments of the sidewalks and the curbing to provide better pedestrian access.

So, each of the meetings goes through in sort of painstaking detail making sure that we've got the right plans in place. So, that work is going well. We've been doing some work on Santilli Circle. That's where we have a very large piece of mitigation with the new flyover bridge. We got some excellent feedback from DOT and some of the engineers

about making that transition go smoother. It's a very important intersection for those that might arrive from the North at our property.

So, those are the kinds of example of things that we do really a good couple of times a week. And that process is moving along very well.

We also are working with the MBTA.

I know that you are fully aware that we had started the procurement process with the MBTA for an important parcel that helps us provide a service road access around the rear of their property.

We recently did some survey work. The good news, we found out there had been some questions about a right-of-way issue back with the tracks. And after going through last week the survey work and at a meeting just yesterday with the MBTA, we realized we don't need that property as part of it. So, that sort of takes one complication in that particular transaction off the table completely.

So, right now the main focus is our team working with the MBTA and their operations

team to make sure that we can get done what we need to get done, but also recognizing the importance of that MBTA facility and making sure that their operations can go on just as smoothly.

So, again very strong progress and a meeting again -- I think there's a meeting again this afternoon with the MBTA and our team. So, again, good news there. And we're progressing very well for all of the items related for the SFEIR.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I ask you, are you still considering the alternative or the second entrance for the service?

MR. DESALVIO: Yes, we are. So, we started that procurement process. In the document, we had actually mentioned that it was subject to some final review of the property lines and what exactly we needed and the ops. team at MBTA. So, right now we're just kind of cleaning up the design. That's the ongoing meeting. Yes, we do want to have that secondary access point.

Next item on our construction

manager. I think the Commission is well aware that we've been working with Gilbane in the preconstruction mode. Now Jacqui and the Wynn design development team in Las Vegas are currently working on converting that preconstruction into more of a formalized arrangement.

So, while that has not been concluded, certainly our teams are negotiating back and forth. And we are going to continue working on that progress. And hopefully we'll have a solution relatively soon in terms of a final determination on construction manager. But Gilbane has been a terrific partner of ours all of the way through. As you'll see later in my presentation, they've been working with us on our outreach sessions as well.

Next item I want to talk about is also very important on our list, and that is our remediation effort. We are currently in the process of doing on-site soil characterization. That's really a fancy term to describe going in and looking at the soil, seeing what's in there so that we can do the

final preparation of our Phase 4 report.

In the DEP chain that Phase 4 is really the last of the big steps before you can actively begin remediation. And it's obviously very important to know we've got out there. So, that work is ongoing now.

And we're looking like that by the end of the year that we should be able to complete the Phase 4 process with the DEP. Our current schedule calls for on-site remediation to begin the first quarter of next year. So, all good news on that front.

As a follow-up to that there's a lot of public interest in the remediation part of our particular project. We've had a great relationship with Tufts University. That started out with the environmental services department but has now sort of spread throughout the rest of Tufts. And economic classes and other groups are now very interested in not only the remediation work but what does this mean longer term for the Mystic River and overall development up and down the Mystic.

1 So, we've had a great relationship 2 with the Mystic River Watershed Association. 3 And we're going to be doing a presentation 4 October 28 at Tufts. And that will be along with the University and Jamie Fay who works 5 6 with us at Fort Point and myself and we'll be talking to some of the students and other folks 8 that join us for the session. 9 But it's something that's important 10 to us since so many people are interested in 11 the remediation part that we want to make sure 12 that we're out there actively talking about it 13 and those sessions are available. In this 14 particular case, it's open to the general 15 public. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, who is 17 sponsoring it at Tufts? 18 MR. DESALVIO: Tufts along with 19 ourselves and the Mystic River Watershed 20 Association. So, October 28 at 7:00 PM at 21 Tufts University in Medford. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There's a tremendous resource of graduate students who 23 24 are -- You're nodding. Good.

Page 78 1 MS. KRUM: We have spoken to them, 2 yes. 3 MR. DESALVIO: It's been a great 4 relationship so far. And it's a very important 5 topic and one that we want to make sure is out 6 there and available for the public to hear about. The next item I want to talk about 8 9 is the vendor and career information sessions. 10 What happened after the award of the license or 11 the designation of the award, our phones really 12 were ringing off the hook. Everyone wanting to 13 know how could I sign up, potentially be a 14 future team member at Wynn. How could I be a 15 vendor or get involved with the project. 16 So, we immediately began planning 17 these sessions so we could get the word out. So far, it's been going very well. On the next 18 19 slide you'll see that we've lined up six of the 20 sessions. We've had three already and three 21 more to go. 22 Monday we were in Malden at Jackson 23 Suite. Tuesday we were in Cambridge at the 24 Marriott. Last night we were in Everett.

1 | Tonight we are going to be in Charlestown.

Next week we're in Chelsea. And we wanted to
do one on the North Shore. So, we're going to
do one at North Shore Community College on the

These are a combination of both
folks that are interested in potentially being
new employees down the road but also those that
may want to get involved in the construction
side of the business as well. And Gilbane has

We've had representatives from the Massachusetts Gaming Commission there. Both Jill Griffin who's been terrific, David Acosta to talk about both the employment and the vendor process for registration.

We've also had representatives, Bob
LePage from the community college group and the
Casino Career Institute. They're talking about
training programs and how people can get
involved in the industry through either the
community college network or eventually through
the new dealer schools.

The building trades have been

30th.

been there.

5

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

represented. Brian Doherty, the head of the
Building Trades Council has been in attendance
at some of the sessions. We've had great
response from the carpenters. The carpenters
are making available at those sessions
opportunities for apprenticeships.

And what we've heard from the carpenters is whenever large-scale projects like this get announced, they get a significant uptick in the amount of people that may want to get involved in the construction trades. And that opens up opportunities for the unions to really use their very strong apprenticeship programs.

So, that particular breakout session has been very active as well. So, it's good to see. And we've been getting tremendous support from the building trades.

And of course Gilbane has been there along with their partner Janey. Janey is the group that works with Gilbane on making sure that veterans, women and minorities will get involved in these jobs. And most importantly is we're looking to trying to break up the

packages into many more than would typically be done in a job.

We're looking at upwards of 150 different bid packages. And if you break them up into smaller pieces, normally that will provide more opportunities especially for some of the folks that don't normally get to participate. So, that's been very well received. And they're getting a lot of interest.

Even though these sessions are not really -- they're not really job fairs for us yet, because really as Mike mentioned earlier, it's a little early for somebody to be signing up for jobs that are two and three years down the road.

But it's not at all early for those that want to get involved in the construction trades. So, in a sense there are really a little bit of construction job fairs, along with information sessions for what we hope will be very robust employment opportunities for all around these communities.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Bob, excuse me.

You were here or Jenny at least was here when
we had the access and opportunity committee
presentation?

MR. DESALVIO: Correct, Jenny was
here. I was out in Las Vegas.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's very

straightforward. It's blocking and tackling, but that's what makes this stuff happen. If you haven't looked at it closely just as a tool to help move things long, it's worth doing. It's a really good model.

And I am sure that the people Susan Moir and whatever the other woman's name was would stop by and talk to you about how to make it work. But it's a really good tool for -The best of intentions aren't enough is the point. You really, really need on the ground committed support not only from the top but at the grassroots, from the unions, from the subcontractors in particular. So, it's an important model to follow up on.

MR. DESALVIO: Great. We will certainly make use of that information as well. But good to see really over the last few nights

1 | the activity at the construction trades table.

2 It was really, really a nice part of each of the session.

The next thing we've been working on extremely aggressively is surrounding community engagement. Right after the designation, I began reaching out to all of the communities that surround us. And quite honestly the approach I'm taking is not just the ones that are formal.

For example, I had a great conversation, we haven't met yet, but over the phone I met Kim Driscoll who is the mayor up in Salem. They have a wonderful tourism community up there. And we know that a lot of guests that will be visiting us are going to want reach out around the area. So, we talked about getting together at a later date.

So, I don't view this as simply the communities that we have agreements with. We are in a larger area here. And I think it's going to be ultimately important for us to talk to everybody. So, we've been very aggressively trying to get out there and talk to our

surrounding partners.

Another good example is Jay Ash over in Chelsea was kind enough to give me a good hour, hour and a half where he took me through all of the upcoming economic development plans in Chelsea. And I have to tell you, it was a fascinating session.

I had no idea that they've got, I think it's close to 1000 different rooms on the books for smaller hotel projects in and around. He was telling me about the Silver Line and the new opportunities that will be available at the transit station there.

So, I think it's important for us to learn a lot about what's going on in all of our neighboring communities. And we are just going to continue that outreach all of the way through. And those discussions have really yielded good results and I'm going to continue to schedule them.

Other engagement with our surrounding communities, we listed a couple events on the next slide. We're involved with the Everett City Fest supporting local vendors.

We sponsored a concert series in Malden for the summer. And the mayor and the community were very thankful for that. We've helped out at the Community Water Chestnut Removal Project.

That's something that's done annually over four days because it's important for the Mystic River.

We've also went to the -- I know

Jenny went down to the Greater New England

Minority Supplier Development Council. They
had their conference. And we were represented
there along with Gilbane. Other things that
we're doing on the next slide, we have a great
relationship with the Boston Bruins foundation.

And we're working -- We're right in the middle
of a series with them for youth ice hockey
clinics that we're doing in East Boston, in
Everett, in Malden and in Cambridge, and then
the youth street hockey as well in Chelsea and
Medford as part of the public school program.

Then the wives of the Boston Bruins players are helping us out. They work with the Charlestown Boys and Girls Club. And they go out and help them go out and they go to a store

over in Somerville. They purchase costumes and get them sort of ready for Halloween. Those are the kinds of things that we really like doing to get out there and show that we're going to be a good community partner for all of our surrounding areas.

A couple of other things I wanted to talk about. We're sponsoring some pretty important events coming up. Boys and Girls Club of Middlesex County, their annual Gala, the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, we just recently joined as a new member. There was a Chelsea Pot-O-Gold banquet, the Everett Independence Day celebration, Everett Chamber of Commerce, we were part of the annual golf tournament. The Veterans, Inc. annual Gala, the Malden Latino Festival and the Malden Pot-O-Gold banquet.

One other one I didn't mention on here, but we've been helping out the Charlestown Little League. They needed some improvements over at the Ryan Field complex, which is very close to where we are. So, they worked with us in telling us what the needs

were. And then we recently were able to give
them a nice check so they can get going on
those programs. But it's a great group. I've
met some of the folks over there. And we're
happy help out the little league because
they're going to be good neighbor to us.

I want to talk a little bit about diversity. We've had ongoing meetings with the Massachusetts Supplier Development office along with previously I mentioned the Greater New England group. So, we're not only focusing on just Massachusetts but there are some good opportunities regionally as well.

We've been working together with
Jill and the Vendor Advisory and Workforce
Development team. We submitted a draft already
of the diversity plan. And then we'll be
working to finalize that in the near future.
So, all of those efforts have been going well.

In closing, what I really want to say is that we've been extremely busy, not skipping a beat, and really focusing a lot on outreach. And I think it's yielded very good results. So, we've hit the ground running

since you've made the designation and we're going to continue to do so. With that Jacqui and I are available for any questions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Do you see any roadblocks to your timetables you provided to us? You gave us a report today and talked generally how you're happy with the progress.

MR. DESALVIO: Very happy.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, do you see anything that could create maybe a gap in time or some delays?

MR. DESALVIO: No. Obviously, our next big filing is the SFEIR. And we want to make sure on that particular document accuracy is more important than speed. So, we want make sure that we have addressed every single item that we got back in the Secretary certificate so we can get that back in and have that go smoothly.

We are not sure which meeting yet we're going to get on the agenda for or the submission date, but we are looking forward to getting that done before the end of the year.

1 I just can't pinpoint the date. Everyone on 2 our team has been focused on making sure that 3 we accurately cover all of the bases on that 4 one. 5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else? 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I think it 8 sounds like a good report and a good start. And we look forward to continuing to look for 9 10 some progress as the months progress. 11 MR. DESALVIO: Great, thank you. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very 13 I think that wraps up the Ombudsman 14 report. We are now going to move to item five 15 on the schedule, Mark Vander Linden, Director of Research and Problem Gambling and his team. 16 17 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Good morning, 18 The Responsible Gaming Commissioners. 19 Framework that was adopted by the Commission 20 last month, September 25. The Responsible 21 Gaming Framework was designed and intended to 22 inform our regulation as a Commission. 23 also intended to inform practice, inform policy 24 of our operators.

Within that Responsible Gaming
Framework was adopted was one issue that still
remains somewhat unresolved. So, I want to
bring that back before you with a report, some
additional information.

That specific section was section

2.2 within the framework, informed player
choice. Under informed player choice is a
specific section that addresses play management
systems. And these play management systems
really are tools that are incorporated onto the
play management software, onto the player cards
to help inform players make better informed
decisions about their specific gambling
behavior.

These types of tools are intended to be individualized for players, allowing them to do a host of things but probably more specifically and overarching would be allow players to set predetermined limits on the amount of money or the amount of time that they are spending at a gambling session.

There was a lot of controversy about this specific practice when it first came up

- 1 and was first introduced into the framework.
- 2 We've paid a lot of attention to that concern.
- 3 We have engaged what were our applicants and
- 4 | now our licensees in a number of discussions
- 5 | dating back to May when it first came up at the
- 6 Mass. Partnership for Responsible Gaming
- 7 meeting.
- 8 We brought it back up again in July
- 9 | with a little bit more intensive focus on that.
- 10 We brought in some local experts. We took a
- 11 | very close look at what evidence exists
- 12 | specifically for these types of play management
- 13 | features. What is the evidence?
- 14 And quite honestly, what came out of
- 15 that meeting, what came out of our research is
- 16 | that these are relatively new ideas. There at
- 17 | times lacks a lot of clarity that we would
- 18 | normally be looking for if we said this is a
- 19 best practice. But at the same time, I think
- 20 that there is a lot of merit that warrants us
- 21 to look at this further.
- 22 So with that, the Commission engaged
- 23 the services of Judith Glynn who is beside me
- 24 here and a team that she works with through her

1 company, Strategic Science, to not just take a 2 look at what we are seeing in terms of the 3 research that has been published on this issue, 4 but to dive down deep into the weeds and take a 5 look at what was the experience of operators in 6 other jurisdictions? What was the experience of gaming manufacturers? What was the 8 experience of regulators?

Both what is their experience as well as what is their recommendations on this specific issue? And that's what we hope to present to you today in what I will turn it over to Judith to present for you.

So with that I want to introduce

Judith Glynn with Strategic Science, and allow
her to provide you a report and summary of the
findings. Judith.

MS. GLYNN: Thank you, Mark. Are you able to hear me okay? It's a pleasure to be here and certainly an honor to put a team together to help inform the great work you're doing in Massachusetts.

So, I first became involved with your Commission when I worked with Mark to

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

prepare for that meeting in July where Dr. Lia
Nower who is a leading researcher in the field
did a review of evidence. And I worked with
Mark and Lia to facilitate that meeting. The
goal was to get that deep understanding of the
concerns around this issue of pre-commitment as
it was articulated in the draft of the
framework that you had seen.

And since that time, what we've done is take a look at the experience of other jurisdictions and bring to you our best advice based on the scientists on our team, their knowledge of the research literature and of the field at large. Certainly, Dr. Alex Blaszcynski and Dr. Lia Nower would be two of the leading scientists in the field of gambling and problem gambling research, and personally have contributed to the literature around limit-setting tools and pre-commitment.

So, what we wanted to do was draw on that experience and then draw on the experience of a number of jurisdictions that had implemented these tools in order to bring the kind of information that you needed to make

your decision. So, we do have some recommendations for you, but first maybe a little bit background.

Maybe if we could move to the next slide. We looked at the countries of New Zealand, Canada, Australia, Norway, Sweden and Singapore. So, there were two things that we did when we looked at these countries. We gathered documents. And that included any documents that their regulator or government agencies had produced to announce it, news releases, press releases, media coverage. We looked for evaluation reports, any kind of documents that we could get that would give us an insight into the kinds of things we needed to know.

So, what we wanted to know from these jurisdictions was what were your objectives when you envisioned the program? Who was your target audience? How did you design the program? What were the key elements of it? What did the customer interface look like? What software? What hardware? How did people access it?

1 And then things like what was the 2 customer response? Did you do marketing and 3 Did you do education? Did people promotion? 4 understand the tools? What was the technological interface like? How was 5 6 implementation? Did it go smoothly? Were there major glitches? Were the glitches 8 technological, operational or in terms of 9 customer understanding? Was staff training 10 what was lacking? 11 And then we asked them some bigger 12 questions like what lessons did you learn? 13 What do you plan to do to improve the program? 14 And then finally if you were giving some advice 15 to the state of Massachusetts on how to do 16 this, would you recommend that they do it? And 17 if you did how would say they should do it? 18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Ms. Glynn, did 19 you look at jurisdictions within the states? 20 You mentioned the state of Missouri. 21 MS. GLYNN: There are two examples, 22 Missouri's loss limits experiment from 1995 to 23 The challenge with those examples and 24 what I'll speak to maybe a little bit more in

the presentation is that what was really being evaluated was a mandatory registration process.

And what we found when we looked at the countries that we did, if you could back up a couple of slides, is that when you had mandatory registration, it completely clouded the customer response to the limit-setting tools.

So, the challenge in the Missouri loss limit experiment was that everybody had to register. And everyone had to use that card with the limit on it. There was no voluntary aspect to it. So, it was difficult for us to use that as an example.

And it was true of some of the other examples we used. Iowa also briefly experimented with loss limits. But again, these were imposed limits. They set a certain dollar amount, \$50 per session in Iowa, \$500 per two-hour session of play in Missouri. But it was mandatory registration and mandatory use of the card and mandatory limits. There was no flexibility.

So, we didn't look too deeply at

1 those because there were richer more current 2 examples in other countries. But we certainly 3 looked at those for their relevance to what you 4 want to do. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 5 Nova Scotia 6 also introduced it mandatorily, right? MS. GLYNN: Yes. It is perhaps the 8 most cloudy introduction of play management tools that we saw in any jurisdiction. 9 10 we'll probably speak a little bit more in 11 detail about that as we go forward. But Nova 12 Scotia, if I may, it is probably the most 13 politically loaded gambling jurisdiction in 14 North America. 15 You might argue with me on that, but it's a small and largely rural community. A 16 17 lot of people have jobs in the fishing 18 industry, extremely high use of government 19 income support programs through employment

fact government.

So, when they introduced the reforms
in particularly when they moved from the

insurance and social assistance. Further

clouded by the fact that the operator is in

20

voluntary to the mandatory model, it became a game to defy government's attempts to monitor and control our behavior. So, it really wasn't about limit-setting tools in many senses.

The challenge for us with each of these jurisdictions was finding the elements that would be relevant to the kind of model that were looking at here in Massachusetts. So, we looked at all of those.

We looked at what we could glean from them, but in some cases the results were so influenced by things like mandatory registration and the reaction to that, the sort of visceral reaction that citizens had that it was very difficult to get a clean evaluation of how the limit setting tools were used and whether or not they were effective.

And we did try to do that very much by looking at all of these different jurisdictions and kind of cross-referencing what we learned. But yes, that is why you don't see us speaking specifically to the Missouri that longer '95 to 2008 loss limit experiment. It wasn't an experiment. It was a

1 | policy and then the Iowa one as well.

Let's do this. We'll jump ahead a

little bit. So, what we were looking at were

all of those things that I spoke to you about.

In many cases, interestingly enough, the most

valuable data for us was in trials rather than

implementation.

What we found with countries that had implemented limit-setting were a couple of things. One is that in some cases they were reluctant to share too much in the way of hard data. They were very willing to speak to their qualitative experience. But in some cases, it was difficult to get hard numbers.

The trials on the other hand, particularly --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Why was that?

MS. GLYNN: Well, in some cases,
it's too early. Singapore said it's just too
early. We can't do it yet. Sweden said we're
just meeting now to develop our data analytics
plan and what our desired outcomes are and what
we're going to measure.

New Zealand said we put this program

1 in place in three months. And we didn't set 2 specific objectives for it when we developed 3 So, in many cases what we learned is that 4 they hadn't actually specified their objectives 5 at the outset. So, when we were asking them 6 what they measured, in some cases they hadn't measured. But where there was a specific trial 8 where they piloted the technology over a 9 contained period of time that's where we were able to get some of the data.

So, what I've done is just extract one jurisdiction. And this is the state of Queensland in Australia. They did two sets of trials. One was in the Redcliffe and I think it's Sandbank (SIC) properties. So, there was one trial there where they implemented voluntary player registration.

Then the other one was the Playsmart analysis of a phase 1 and phase 2. So, what they did here were two forms of voluntary registration or enrollment. Phase 1 was without incentives. And phase 2 was with incentives. So, this is where we got some really interesting data where you can actually

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

see some comparisons.

What we heard from these jurisdictions loud and clear was that the two major things really made it challenging. One was that they rarely implemented what they originally envisioned. Almost always some kind of political influence came into play, and they went from voluntary to mandatory and back. Or they went to mandatory with a watered-down version.

Even in Norway they only had six months with a voluntary system before the government changed and put a mandatory system in place. So, they really said envision a system and implement it cleanly. Do not change course part way through because you're not going to get a smooth and a clean implementation.

The other huge piece was you must educate staff and you must educate players. If you don't have that interaction between staff and players, you are not going to get people understanding and enrolling and seeing the tools as relevant.

And related to that was this idea that unless you promote the program as normal, people will not see it as salient. They won't see it as relevant to them. If you say these are tools to reduce the harm from problem gambling, nobody will sign up. Even if you say they're responsible gambling tools, they think that that's for people who are already at risk. When they were positioned as normal budgeting and time and money management tools that's when the success was seen.

So, in these Queensland trials, if we go back to the first slide on Queensland, one of the things they noted was that with the active promotion, and they did some pretty active promotion, you can see they had a signon incentive. They had a chance to win a weekly draw. The dedicated six staff to working the floor and promoting the use of the tools and helping people through the signup process.

They sent promotional letters to all of their players. And even with that, which in our review is probably as aggressive a

promotion campaign as anyone did, some of them did zero or very near to zero in terms of education and promotion. And many of them were catching up after implementation, realizing they had to train staff, send out ambassadors that kind of thing.

But if they did active promotion, it took three to four months for usage to peak.

That was where they would get players who were using the tools actively, setting real limits that had some meaning to them. And feeling that the limits were useful to them.

So, at the Sandgate property after the third month that was when 90 percent of them enrolled after the third month. And in the Redcliff property it was after the fourth month that 79 percent of the players enrolled.

So, what you saw is that people needed some time to understand the tools, to get used to them and then they started to use them in a meaningful way.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me, Judith, how do those numbers square with the 13 to 28 percent? This says enrolled, but your report

says that 13 to 28 percent actually used it and spent daily limits.

MS. GLYNN: So, these are subs of that 13 to 28 percent. So, of the people who used the system, 90 percent enrolled in the third month. So, it was slow to get to that rate.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, I see.

MS. GLYNN: That's a percentage of people enrolled.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I thought you meant by the third month. Okay.

MS. GLYNN: Those numbers are high.

There are jurisdictions that were still

experiencing that lower kind of one percent and
below 10 percent uptake as well on the tools,

which you'll see it continues to be a concern.

So, just as a comparison, they did
12 months without promotion. And it took them
as long in 12 months to get the same number as
they got in four months with promotion. So,
what this tells us is if you do it right, if
you promote the program, if you educate
players, if you have ambassadors, people will

1 use the tools.

2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Wait a second.

3 You're saying that when they promoted the

4 signup you then got 13 to 28 percent.

5 MS. GLYNN: Yes, within four months.

Whereas with the other method, it took 12 months to get there.

8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

9 MS. GLYNN: So, the interesting

10 thing is you use the promotion to sign them on.

11 Then they signed on and said, hey, if I had

12 understood how valuable this was going to be, I

13 would have signed on without incentives. But

14 you have to have the promotion and the

incentives to let people see the value. We

16 heard that from every jurisdiction we spoke to.

So, if we just go to the next slide,

18 | we look at how did players respond to these

19 tools? What did they think they meant for

20 them? A hundred percent of the players

21 surveyed found the procedure was

22 straightforward. They were really pleased with

23 the customer interface. There were some

24 | specific findings around the customer

interface. They really worked at making that a really warm and pleasant interface.

Another thing we heard, for example, Norway said ours looked too much like government collecting your data. And that's why people resisted. Make it warm. Make it engaging. Ninety-five percent felt confident using the card. They felt they understood and they were using it properly.

Fifty-eight percent felt that it made them think more about how much money they were spending on gambling. And that's really important. Hang onto that thought making people think about how much they're spending on gambling, being more explicit in their decision-making.

Forty-five percent said it made them think more about how affordable it was for them to gamble. They saw the card-based system of limit-setting as a major benefit to them. So, a benefit of having a loyalty card was having these limit-setting tools.

If we can go next slide. The maximum was interesting too. The \$50-\$100 a

day maximize is an interesting piece because you'll see in our recommendations we talk about giving people some sense of what might be normal or average rates for gambling in a session.

If we go to the next line, really significant improvement reported across all groups. I am going to point out that one of the flaws with the research around -- certainly the scientific literature around this concept of pre-commitment or limit-setting is this really narrow focus on harm from problem gambling.

And if you think about these tools the way they were originally envisioned that's not really what they're about. Despite that, there was some improvement in the problem gambler group, but this was not the target audience.

One operator said to us problem gamblers are our lost souls. We are not targeting problem gamblers. We are targeting the average player. Twenty-three percent of those that would have moderate risk reported

that they were better at sticking with their limits, the limits that they had sent.

Twenty-eight percent of players reported that they had reduced their spending and that it was as a result of using these tools. So, 62 percent said this made me think more explicitly about how much money I was spending on gambling.

And if we can go to the next slide.

This just speaks to the details. It really came through to us from every single informant we interviewed, the details of how you do this, how the technology works, how the staff interact with the customers and the customers with the technology, this is going to determine whether you're successful or not.

They really appreciated these are five things: a personalized limit reminder message; setting limits based on the money you want to spend. So, that was the way -- How much do you want to spend on gambling today? That was a relevant way for them to think about what they were going to do that day.

Sorry that should be preset playing

1 limits, not present. I'm sorry. So, they 2 appreciated having some preset limits that they 3 could use to guide their behavior. They liked 4 getting those player activity statements, which 5 is part of your framework already. And that's 6 good news. And they liked having these breaks 8 where it said, okay, you know you're at 60 9 percent of your limit now. You're at 90 10 percent of your limit now. Oh, you're at 100 11 percent of your limit. Your game has stopped. 12 You need to make a decision now. Are you going 13 to go forward or not, because this is how much 14 you said you wanted to spend. 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So, these are 16 five ingredients to success you said? 17 MS. GLYNN: Yes. 18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: How do you 19 define success? 20 MS. GLYNN: How do we define 21 Strong uptake and the tools are seen success? 22 as effective and valuable to your players. 23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: By the 24 players?

```
1
                MS. GLYNN: Yes.
                                  And I'll speak
 2
            That's very much how we think that this
 3
    program should be positioned as value to
 4
    players. So, if we go to the next slide.
5
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If you're done
6
    with Queensland, that was the trial. That was
 7
     the data from the two trials, right?
8
                MS. GLYNN:
                            Yes.
9
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, they now
10
     implemented this in 49 venues across Queensland
11
     apparently?
12
                MS. GLYNN:
                            Yes.
13
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What's happening
14
     with --
15
                MS. GLYNN: We don't have data from
16
     the implementation yet. The interesting thing
17
     is that Australia was the most hot debate
18
     around pre-commitment. I don't know if you're
19
     aware of that, but it was a huge political hot
20
              In fact, you could say that at least
    potato.
21
     one government fell over the issue of pre-
     commitment.
22
23
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
                                  Really?
24
                MS. GLYNN: So, it became very hotly
```

1 debated in Australia. They are much more 2 polarized in terms of the issue of gambling in 3 Australia. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 4 Don't they own 5 the casinos in Australia just like they do in 6 Norway? MS. GLYNN: Oh, no. No, it's all 8 private sector. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But they own 10 them in Norway? 11 MS. GLYNN: Yes, in Norway it is a 12 government operator, yes. And that actually 13 would speak to some of that resistance in 14 Australia because they are used to the private 15 sector being able to do what it wants. 16 So, when this was going to be 17 imposed, these mandatory limit-setting tools 18 that where you got the resistance. And really 19 the resistance was to the mandatory aspect of 20 it. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Go ahead. 22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: You answered 23 my question. What was the polarization all 24 about? And it was the mandatory aspect.

1 MS. GLYNN: The polarization is 2 there in Australia around gambling already. 3 Dr. Alex Blaszcynski who was one of our team 4 members found himself in the midst of that 5 Where he was being seen by the 6 responsible gambling advocates as being aligned with industry, because he spoke out against 8 mandatory limit setting and said it doesn't 9 work. 10 One of the wonderful things about 11 working with Dr. Blaszcynski on this report was 12 that he came to say I wholeheartedly with every 13 ounce of my being support what we're 14 recommending here because this is doing it 15 right. And it will surprise people because of 16 the way he was perceived in that Australian 17 debate as having aligned himself with the 18 industry who were resisting the introduction of 19 pre-commitment. 20 But what he really spoke to was when 21 you make it mandatory, you miss the point. 22 I guess that's what this slide is about. 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Sorry, one more

Queensland question. The trials were in 2005.

1 When did they implement these in the 49 venues?

MS. GLYNN: I don't know the exact

3 date, Chairman Crosby.

4

5

6

9

10

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: More or less? I mean was it like several years ago? It was 10 years ago when they did the trial.

7 MS. GLYNN: I would have to look it 8 up. I apologize.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: How long did the trial last?

MS. GLYNN: Two years.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, two years.

So, the soonest would have been 2008. It'd be interesting to know obviously because the data of how the system is actually operating versus how it worked in this experiment would be

17 tremendously interesting.

MS. GLYNN: Yes. We did get that from a lot of the jurisdictions who had it in place. I think what I might suggest, and ask questions as we go, but when we get to speaking to some of the specific recommendations that we've made, maybe what I can do is talk about which jurisdictions fed into those or drove

some of those recommendations in terms of their experience with the limit-setting tools.

And that might give you a sense of what you're looking for there. Because you're looking for who is doing it right now, and the choice of Queensland was because they had really clean data for us to use. And that was challenging with the jurisdictions that have it in place.

So, this next slide is really about terminology. I'm sorry, if we can go back to the pre-commitment slide. One of the things that's happened in the world of gambling is that this issue of pre-commitment has come to be seen as a problem gambling prevention tool. Or a tool that is really all about preventing people from developing gambling problems.

But what we as a team would like you to do is go back to first principles. What does pre-commitment mean? It has a long history in the economics and consumer behavior literature starting with I think Strotes (PHONETIC). And then in the 80s Thaler and Thomas Schelling, one of your most famous US

economist Nobel Prize winner. They spoke about this concept.

They named it pre-commitment but they said we're not inventing the concept.

What we're doing is naming a behavior that people use to manage themselves. So, what they really talk about in this literature is that we all understand that we are dynamic beings.

That when we sit here in our calm and present state and we think about our long-term goals for our weight and our physical health and our financial health and our relationship health, we say these other are the things that I want to achieve.

But tonight after two glasses of wine or on the weekend in the jewelry store in front of some sparkly baubles or some beautiful shoes or all of these different things, we know that we will become carried away in that aroused state. And that we will potentially make decisions that imperil our long-term objectives. We all know this. We all do this.

The wisest among us more often than not set limits on our future behavior based on

our long-term objectives. We force ourselves to make the right choice later. Or at the very least, we delimit our choices so that we can't do as much harm to our long-term objectives as we might when we are carried away. That's the concept of pre-commitment.

It's not about people who have lost control. It's not about people who need treatment. It's about normal people being more explicit about how they manage themselves.

And one of the best examples they used was the old Christmas savings account. They said the bank protects all of your savings accounts in the ways that it protects all of its accounts. But the Christmas savings account is more protected than the others because not only is it protected from fraud and all kinds of other threats, but it's protected from its most important threat, you.

So, you create this savings account. You contribute to this savings account because you want the bank to put those administrative and sort of ceremonial barriers in place that will limit you or reduce the likelihood that

you will imperil your long-term objectives by spending that money. That's the concept of pre-commitment.

So, it's with that understanding of pre-commitment that we as a team are recommending that you implement pre-commitment.

Then maybe if we move to the next slide, the key question was should

Massachusetts move forward with a precommitment program? And the members of our team strongly and wholeheartedly recommend that you do. Not only do we think it would accomplish a lot of good, but you're in a wonderful position to benefit from the advances in technology, the reductions in cost and the lessons learned from other jurisdictions in doing that. So, we strongly recommend you do it.

But we say with that that if you're going to do it, you must make it meaningful and you must do it right. So, with that in mind, we have 15 detailed recommendations. They're not down to the finest point, but they speak to the things that we heard and read from these

other jurisdictions in terms of the things that you need to do to make this an effective program.

What I've done is group the recommendations, those 15 recommendations not according to numbers one, two, three, four or five, but rather in terms of the goals that they speak to.

So, if we move to the next slide, the two things Chairman Crosby you'll recall, the two things we heard from industry was around effectiveness were around uptake.

Uptake rates are so low, it can't possibly be worth the money that we would spend putting this technology in place.

So, how do you influence uptake.

That was a really big important thing. And this is what we heard from the key informants.

And this is what we derived from the reports.

You must position these tools positively. You must show the players that these have value for them. And you must make them salient.

Don't talk about them as preventing problem gambling. You don't even necessarily

- 1 want to talk about them as responsible 2 gambling. You might call it positive play. 3 You might say they're budgetary tools. 4 in fact why we would recommend that you not 5 necessarily use the term pre-commitment because 6 it's becomes sort of contaminated in the 7 gambling world with its association with 8 problem gambling. 9 Position these as targeted to all 10 players. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's become 12
  - associated with problem gambling and mandatory implementation.
    - MS. GLYNN: Yes. We all know words Once words have become contaminated matter. with associations, it's lot more work to eliminate those associations than just shift your language.
    - So, call them limit setting tools or something similar to that. Something that's very innocuous and speaks to this idea that you're helping people manage themselves. You have to do strong education and marketing. this is out and in.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So, you need to educate your players, but you also need the staff at these venues to be educated and to understand why the tools would be valuable to their players and what role they can play in helping players both understand why they're valuable and how to use them.

If you have that communication in those two directions, active promotion and education out to your players and lots of internal promotion and education and training to your staff, the two come together.

In New Zealand, they had almost a complete breakdown in communication because they implemented it so quickly. But they responded so quickly with staff training and ambassadors on the floor that they started to turn it around immediately. So, really this is a key part of making it work.

Integration with loyalty cards, everybody said to do this. Everybody said to make it as easy as possible and integrate it with their existing loyalty card so that it is a simple tool for them to use. And key again,

it must become a normal part of the play experience. Make it normalized.

Incentives to encourage continued use. Almost no jurisdictions offered any incentives while you were using the tools.

Some of them offered a sign-up bonus. None of them offered loyalty points while in play.

It's a new thing that you can do to show players that it has value and that there's a reward for managing yourself well.

So, if I set limits, if I use the tools actively, I set limits and I maintain limits, I get bonused on that as well. That was a key that people recommended strongly.

Default limits, this is going to be a little bit controversial. There are two things here, really two thoughts, default limits and an opt out program. These are the pieces that you'll probably have the most questions about.

We wrestled long and hard as a team before making such strong recommendations. And we probed this issue with key informants. But at the end of the day, we strongly feel that

1 you should make it an opt out system. If you 2 are indeed positioning this as a normal part of 3 the player experience, then it should be that 4 when they put their player card in, the 5 assumption is made that they will set limits. 6 And if they don't set limits, default limits will apply unless they actively 7 8 say you know what, I'm okay. I don't need to 9 set limits. And then they opt out of the 10 program. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 11 Doesn't that 12 start to sound like mandatory? 13 MS. GLYNN: It's the first time they 14 put the card in they get the chance to say no. 15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But if you 16 default them to say to opt out, you've assumed 17 that it's --18 MS. GLYNN: -- you've assumed that 19 it's the right choice and the normal choice. 20 So, if you look at any other instances where we 21 use opt out in society, it's because we're 22 making it easy for people to do the smart 23 thing. 24 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But you don't

opt out of a Christmas savings account.

MS. GLYNN: No, but you do out of environmentally friendly behaviors with power use and other things. There are increasingly structures put in place where you opt out if you decide you don't want to use the tool that's been offered to you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That is creating a normative approach to what may not be a normative -- in fact a normative approach to the tool.

If we really want to make this a useful tool -- And I think it is a useful tool to have in the arsenal. -- it seems to me one is far better off doing the kind of education and incentivizing that would allow people to make the choice consciously. And then use the tool and get the benefit from it. You talked about words have meaning and they obviously do have meaning. By using this as a budgeting device the way you budget for furniture or shoes or food would be it seems to me a very helpful way to go about it.

But once you begin to start

defaulting people into it and then even worse in my view defaulting people to certain limits that somehow express what is normative strike me as the kind of thing that in fact can push people away.

Sorry, just to finish that, and give this whole regime the kind of nanny state approach that I think is particularly in this day and age terribly off-putting and counterproductive.

MS. GLYNN: I accept your perspective. And it's definitely one of the more controversial aspects of this. If you accept that this would be a normal practice that people should routinely be setting a limit when they walk into the facility anyway, and we're not talking about annual limits or anything like that. What we might talk about is within session limits and maybe monthly limits because those are kind of the basis on which the average person budgets.

If you're really positioning this as something that normally you'd like them to do or normally they probably should do when they

1 go gambling, then opt out, as long as you're 2 very clear in your education and very clear 3 when they put their card in that this is what's 4 in place, you are more than welcome to change 5 And you have staff trained to make sure 6 that people understand that -- And I would argue that in the gambling venues, they are 8 going to want players to be making that 9 explicit choice. -- then what you'll find is 10 that players will begin to use the tools in see 11 their usefulness over time. It's part of 12 making it a normalized practice. 13 But I understand it's one of the 14 more sensitive recommendations. It definitely 15 has some views on either side of it. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I ask 16 17 about this notion of normal. We have a very 18 tight market here in New England with players 19 having multiple options, not just in 20 Massachusetts but nearby around it. How could 21 something be normal to a player if it only occurs in Massachusetts, for example? 22 23 The reality that our neighbors don't 24 have these, because they don't or the culture

around the United States, which is different
from say Australia that is surrounded by ocean,
how could that be perceived as normal in our
state only?

MS. GLYNN: Norms and attitude shift over time. And you're certainly the leaders in other areas of which you're doing.

Massachusetts is doing things in the implementation of gambling that no other US state has done. Certainly, in the regulatory structure, in the funds you've set aside for research, so, you're leaders in a number of areas. And yes, you would be leaders in this area. You absolutely would be leaders.

But norms aren't about what everybody is doing already. Sometimes norms and laws or norms and rules have a very dynamic relationship over time. So, if you talk about normal levels, then you make a statement about what you think is normative. But another part of this is that we are strongly recommending lots of player testing and lots of tweaking and refining as you put the system in place. And seeing where the points of resistance are. And

sometimes you think it's one thing and it's something else.

So, the jurisdictions that we talked to that were really making constant improvements in response to players were the ones that were successful. But yes, it would set you apart from your fellow states. There's no question about that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There are two tiers to the opting in and out. You could have an opt out program which assumes you're going to be setting limits but has a button down below that says I don't want to set a limit. That's one level of opt out.

There's another level of opt out which is the default. If you don't do anything, then a number comes up.

MS. GLYNN: Yes. They're paired here just for description but there are two separate recommendations. And you could certainly do what you just said. You could say opt out of limit-setting at all and not set default limits. There is no question that default limits are challenging.

1 In Norway, they have a maximum of --2 It's not really a meaningful maximum. 3 daily maximum is 99,999 krona. So, it's 4 basically as high in five digit as you can get. They have this idea that they could just give 5 6 players a sliding scale so they could set their limit. 8 But all of the limits were in the 9 So, they did interviews and everyone middle. 10 said I consider myself to be an average 11 gambler. So, I put my level in the middle. We 12 found that very interesting. Most people 13 wanted to know sort of what does an average 14 gambler spend. And they wanted to put 15 themselves in that range. So, that is part of 16 the thinking around those defaults. 17 So, I think you should consider them 18 as a Commission as two separate 19 recommendations. They're not dependent on each other. You don't have to do one and the other. 20 21 We're recommending both. But we recognize that 22 there is controversy around both of those 23 recommendations. 24 Of the two, certainly the opt out as

an approach is one that we probably feel more strongly about than having the default limit simply because it is channeling to give people what are normative limits.

So, you would need to be very careful, use data. There was one suggestion that the research team that you have here in Massachusetts might be able to as part of their population survey gather some data around what people consider to be normal spending on gambling.

There are ways that you could use that and then you could say here are some limits that are based on, and tell them what they are from. And educate them so they know what those limits are based on. But definitely they are two separate recommendations.

So, and we may go back to those, but I'll just quickly go through a couple of more -- this and two more slides and then we can come back to the issues that you want to speak about the most.

Multiple access points, some players want help. They want to go to customer

- 1 service. They want an ambassador on the floor.
- 2 They want someone to walk them through it.
- 3 Other players don't want anything that imperils
- $4 \mid$  their privacy. They want to maybe do it on the
- 5 | website at home where they login. Or they want
- 6 to do it on a kiosk or in a corner. Or they
- 7 | want to do it on a machine.
- 8 So, New Zealand started off with
- 9 just a kiosk. Then they moved it to a machine
- 10 | -- I'm sorry. They started it with the machine
- 11 interface but some players were shy to set
- 12 limits when there were players around them.
- 13 | So, they set up kiosks. And their enrollment
- 14 started to increase. So, this idea of multiple
- 15 access points that address both those who want
- 16 help and those who want privacy.
- 17 Then another one was if people have
- 18 opted out and said I don't want to set limits,
- 19 that doesn't mean they might not be rethinking
- 20 | it three months later. So, have some
- 21 milestones.
- 22 Say after three months or after
- 23 they've gambled a certain number of times where
- 24 | you ask them again would you like to reconsider

setting some limits for your daily or your monthly gambling.

So, those features are all designed to make sure that you have the highest possible uptake of these tools. And over time, people will see them as valuable and useful. And you'll start to see the kind of data that we saw in Queensland in terms of the response and the usefulness to players.

There's another set of recommendations on the next slide that talk about how do you make sure they're effective? So, one of the things that the team talked about is if you're going to do it, they need to be meaningful. They need to be effective. They actually need to give people that pause so they have time to do that self-management.

One of the things that seems to be standard in I think all but one jurisdiction is that once you've set your limits, if you decide you want to raise them, then you have to wait 24 hours for that raise to take effect.

In one jurisdiction, New Zealand, as long as you're below 80 percent of your limit

1 you can raise and lower without any 2 consequences. But once you start to near your 3 limit, then you have to wait 24 hours for a 4 raise. And that's where they're trying to 5 prevent people from getting carried away in 6 this aroused state. So, definitely recommend a cooling 8 off period for increases to take effect. 9 Lowering limits should take effect immediately 10 or as quickly as the gaming management system 11 is able to respond. So, sometimes they might 12 go a few dollars over or something just because 13 they are in the middle of a game. We're not 14 talking about a hard, hard limit, but that 15 lowering limits should take effect almost 16 immediately. 17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What happens 18 then when they reach their limit? 19 MS. GLYNN: So, this is important. 20 There are jurisdictions that simply log you out 21 for the day. You're done. We know that that's 22 probably not the right option for 23 Massachusetts.

So, we thought about it. How do we

make the tools meaningful so that we're in keeping with that concept of self-management that this term was first invented for.

4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And voluntary, 5 right?

MS. GLYNN: Yes. So, we want the screen to stop. We want the game to stop. And for it to say to you, you've reached the limit -- Well, first of all at 60 and 90 maybe, or 75 and 85, different jurisdictions have tried different thresholds. And then when you get to your limits, it should say you've reached your limit. And you have to acknowledge that.

And then the game stops. You're not in the middle of your game anymore. It's telling you that you've met your limit.

If you decide you want to continue playing, you're reminded that for any play after that you're no longer going to collect loyalty points. So, we're trying to disincent you to go beyond your preset limits, until the next time period, the next session or the next month or whatever it is that you've set that limit for.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But you 2 earlier were talking about incentivizing by 3 adding points if you signed up. 4 MS. GLYNN: So, if you went beyond your limit -- So, let's say you reach your 5 6 limit and you maintain your limits over a certain number of visits, well, you would get 8 rewarded for that. So, one of the things you 9 would be notified of is you're not going to get 10 those bonus points for maintaining your limit. 11 And we're not going to give you bonus points 12 for the gambling that you continue. If you gamble another \$200, you will not collect 13 14 loyalty points for that extra 200. 15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Could the mind 16 then say, well, I already had a bonus because I 17 signed up for the limit. I already was "ahead" 18 in my points. I'm going to be able to now 19 afford not accruing any more points and that 20 would be a wash. 21 But you would also have MS. GLYNN: 22 forgone the extra points you would have gotten 23 for maintaining your limits. So, hopefully, 24 what we're trying to do is --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You're going to take back the points that I had from signing up?

MS. GLYNN: No, you get sign-up points but then you also get points over time for maintaining limits. So, we're recommending both. You get some points for setting limits but then you also accumulate some points over time for maintaining limits.

Then if you start to exceed limits on a regular basis, you won't get those points for maintaining limits anymore. But we're further recommending, and a number of jurisdictions are doing this, once you set the limit that you told us that you wanted to play for, you're not going to get anymore loyalty points until the next 24-hour period and you're notified of that. So again, you're notified.

There is also the option of having every 30 minutes after that a reminder.

Remember, you said that your limit for today was -- You could do it every 30 minutes, every hour, every so many spins, whatever you like.

But just to sort of reinforce the idea that

they said in their calm, wise state that they didn't want to spend any more than this.

Then the last piece was the provision of complementary play information tools. So, a lot of these programs had all sorts of other play management tools in place. I would argue that what you've already got in your framework represents a very fulsome set of complementary play information tools. So, you have those pieces in place to complement a limit-setting system for your players.

Then just one more slide. So, I think the biggest message from the team that worked on this is that Massachusetts is in the very wonderful position of being able to benefit from the passage of time and experience. So, in the early iterations of limit-setting tools or play management systems, you saw jurisdictions that at least in one case spent millions to develop software and hardware to retrofit across four or five different machine manufacturers with a number of different platforms and gaming management systems.

There was hardware. There was software. There were large annual operating costs. That is simply no longer the case.

As this has become a more commonly used tool in more than a dozen jurisdictions in the world, the gaming technology industry has responded. The technology has advanced. And you now have off-the-shelf packages that are tied to gaming management systems or that can be put on top of a coordinated set of gaming management systems that can implement limit-setting tools.

I understand that Mark has some information for you on what he has been quoted as current day cost for those systems. But you're now talking about a total capital cost of well under 200,000 maybe 300,000, 350 in year one. And annual licensing fees that range anywhere from \$50- to \$200,000. This is not expensive in the context of the gaming industry. It's no longer costly the way that it was seven or eight years ago.

Also, the advances in technology, the refinements, the New Zealand experience was

perhaps our favorite in terms of relevance for you as a jurisdiction. They did a really good job of having tremendous clarity in their regulation.

In fact, Bally in response said that was the easiest build because the regulations were so specific that we were able to build exactly the system they wanted. And it was very much a collaboration in New Zealand among regulator, gaming operator and gaming technology company to build that Bally system, which now will be a world-leading system. It's part of their executive bonus suite.

One of the charms of the system or attractions for a gaming operator is that when you're playing at machine 227 then it can send a message directly to that machine and say we know you like this game, would you like to switch. Or we know you like this, and it's on special in the dining room and we would like to give it to you today.

So, it has that direct to the individual, to the machine they're playing ability to bonus. So, it's a very attractive

gaming management system. But it has this feature that can be added on for a very modest cost in comparison to previous technological offerings.

So, you have the benefit of that development in technology and that lowering of costs, which is the case with any new technology. But you also have increasingly -- The government of Nova Scotia was extremely forthcoming in terms of all of the things they did wrong and all of the things that they would recommend you do right.

And when asked do you think that limit-setting tools are good, they said absolutely. In fact, every other member -- So, Nova Scotia is part of the Atlantic Lottery Corporation, which is four provinces in Eastern Canada. So, they together manage gaming. And all of the other provinces are this year rolling out the GTECH system for limit-setting.

Nova Scotia is going to take a break because of the heatedness of the political situation. But when asked what they are doing next, they said we consider these tools to be

an industry best practice. And we are going to be watching for what the right solution is for Nova Scotia.

So, what we heard is that it has benefit. And then they told us how to ensure its success. And that's what you see in some of these detailed recommendations and certainly in some of the conversations that we've had with Mark around things that you could do.

Keeping it very simple. Only introducing very modest limits initially and things like that. So, we really feel that here in Massachusetts you are very much in the position to benefit from that learning across the world and from those advances in technology and the decreasing cost to do something in Massachusetts that will be really leadership work.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you, very much. That's really well thought. Questions?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I looked with Mark at G2E at some of the tools that are there. They are there. The interface is simple. They're easy to use. I believe that

they are a useful budgeting device if properly presented to a player.

But then when we get into some of the detail, I still am having difficulty. I don't want to beat the horse that I just beat a few minutes ago.

MS. GLYNN: No, no, please.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No, no. That horse is tired. It's still standing. But more thematically you define success as high uptake and player satisfaction, player belief in the utility of the tool. And I accept those. I can understand those two philosophically.

But then when we begin to drill down into the specifics in that menu of specific items designed to ensure success, if success is designed subjectively, it seems to me that we are getting into a realm without a lot of data that's designed to tell people what a useful tool ought to look like rather than the tool that they believe is in fact useful.

And to the extent we do that, it seems to me particularly without data, a lot of data to support it, we do run the risk of

getting back into that philosophical quagmire that I articulated in connection with those two other specifics.

And that rather than the concept as a whole is where I am having a little bit of difficulty, not with the concept but with the detail.

MS. GLYNN: Yes. I think from at least half of the informants that we interviewed, they said -- a couple of them said more player testing, or a lot more player testing or do player testing and then do more and then do more.

So, they really did talk about working with people to figure out the best way to introduce these tools or the best way to have the tools function. If you have a lot of discomfort with the idea of default limits or of opt out, it may be that you could get some data beforehand that would help increase your comfort or your sense of whether or not people would see this as useful and helpful or whether they would see it as intrusive.

Because I think that's at the heart

of what you are saying is that if we want them
to adopt it, and we want them to see it as
normal and we want them to see it as useful, we
don't want to annoy them at the beginning by
suggesting that we know better than they do by
offending them, by intruding too much into
their ability to manage themselves.

And I agree that that is something that needs to be done with care, but I think that you could gather enough information with some fairly simple work to be able to introduce a program that may be staged where you would be able to have confidence that you are going to overcome that.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I was interested, I know that I saw Singapore on the one chart. And I believe you said that it was too soon to have data.

MS. GLYNN: Yes. They've actually agreed to meet with us in November.

So, one of the things that I would like to do with some indulgence from Mark is there are some jurisdictions that said I will

have data on this date or I will be in Toronto 1 2 on this date, can I come and talk to you then, 3 because I can't officially -- Basically, in 4 Singapore he said if you want me to officially transmit information, there's a formal approval 5 6 process that has to come from your Commission 7 to my government. It was quite an elaborate 8 thing. And it's too early. 9 But I'm going to be in Toronto in 10 November. And I'd like to talk to you about 11 what we are seeing so far. So, in the case of 12 Singapore we did not get to do any key 13 informant interviews. All we got to do is to 14 look at their process and their system. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What is the 16 process -- What is the model in Singapore? 17 MS. GLYNN: It's a mandatory model. 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It is 19 mandatory. 20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: They debated 21 whether Singaporeans could gamble there. There 22 was a big emphasis on --23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: You have to 24 pay \$100 for a day pass.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right, right. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Other questions? COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 3 I think it was 4 already discussed, but I have thought about 5 Throughout the report, there is a little 6 bit of a notion of mistrust to government watching. In this day and age, as Commissioner 8 McHugh was probably alluding, big brother, the 9 notion that somebody is always watching. 10 occurs to me that may be a disincentive for 11 people to use some of these tools in general. 12 I am also very interested in whether 13 you would think that cultural beliefs and 14 attributes, differences between the United 15 States and say Australia or Norway -- I can 16 think of Norway because I had a roommate from 17 The acceptance of government is very Norway. 18 different or the government's role for example. 19 What can you tell us about that? 20 That's the context that I was looking at in my 21 previous questions as to how could that be 22 perceived as normal here in Massachusetts? 23 MS. GLYNN: I want to talk a little 24 bit about culture too in another sense.

first let's talk about the issue of government and culture around acceptance of government kind of intrusion or monitoring in your life.

Certainly, even Sweden where they said we have to present our SIN number to do almost anything, we got heavy resistance when we had mandatory registration for gambling because it was one area of people's lives where they didn't have to register. So, when we required them to register, we got great resistance.

So, certainly I think when there is that sense of government imposing some form of monitoring or control of behavior, you will get strong resistance. I'm not sure that that is relevant to a US state because you have private operators.

And we didn't see that resistance as much in jurisdictions where private operators were the ones. So, in New Zealand, Sky City implemented their pre-commitment or limit-setting program at the Auckland and Christ Church locations. They unrolled it. I think they had seven days' notice and unrolled it

1 across all of their machines.

Highly successful. It was not seen as imposed by government at all because the private sector operator implemented it. So, they worked with the players to educate them. And the players saw the casino as putting it in place rather than government.

So, definitely in jurisdictions where government is the operator, an agency of government is operator, so that's true of North Katiping (PHONETIC) and (INAUDIBLE) in Norway and Sweden. It's true in every province in Canada.

But in Australia, in New Zealand, in the US, you have private sector operators. So, at most people would have to reach beyond the operator and say somehow you were forcing the industry to do something that was good for them.

But I would argue that in the US because there is maybe some cynicism about the gaming industry that it would almost counter any sense that this was government controlled. That people would see it as yes, it's a good

thing that the casino has to offer me these tools. It's something that's helpful to me.

So, I think in terms of that culture, it was where it was mandatory. And more important than limit-setting, it was registration that they had to register with all of their personal information, and that would go to government.

The big concern in Nova Scotia was that it was going to go to the tax office and that it would imperil their government assistance programs.

They couldn't shake that. It didn't matter how much education they did. People believed that that information being gathered by the government agency that ran gambling was going to share it with the government agency that collected their taxes.

So, you simply don't have that dynamic here. I agree that you need to be careful that it doesn't seem big brotherish. I understand Commissioner McHugh's concerns. And I think they're very legitimate. But I don't think you're going to run into that same sense

that government is somehow monitoring them. Or that someone knowing how much they spend on gaming will affect whether they can collect their social assistance check.

The other piece though that you reminded me of that I had forgotten was that there were some cultural influences at play in some of these jurisdictions where they found that for example, in New Zealand their Asian players were not using the tools.

So, they did interviews with their Asian players. What they said was that I'm here to gamble. Why would I set limits? It's all about gambling and having fun. So, then they brought in models from countries like Singapore and used the kind of language that they had used in those countries around managing play.

And then they did some interactions. They put the screens in both English and Chinese. And the uptake in the Asian population rose, because they got sensitive to the cultural differences. They asked questions and then they responded accordingly.

1 So, I'm not sure the extent to which 2 in Massachusetts you might have large cultural 3 groups that you would need to have that same 4 kind of sensitivity to in terms of maybe some targeted education, some ambassadors on the 5 6 floor and maybe messaging that is slightly different. That was another finding that we 8 had from some of these jurisdictions. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: When did New 10 Zealand implement its system? 11 2011, I believe. MS. GLYNN: 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What's the uptake in New Zealand? 13 MS. GLYNN: I don't know what it is 14 15 right now. I know after six months, it was 16 only one percent. So, they've been working 17 very hard to increase it. Actually no, it 18 wasn't 2011. It was 2012 for New Zealand. 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And when you 20 talked to them, you didn't ask them what the 21 uptake was now? 22 MS. GLYNN: I did and they said they 23 didn't have that data yet. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's hard to

believe. Have they implemented all of these reforms that they are recommending we adopt?

MS. GLYNN: They've implemented many of them. And they were very interested in things like incenting with loyalty points. So, they actually think they're going to start doing that.

But a lot of the promotion and staff training came from their ideas. They were recommended in other places. But they've done a lot of work with the technological interface, moving the buttons around and making the screen very user-friendly. Initially, it took over a small part of the screen now it takes over the whole screen.

So, they've implemented I would say the vast majority. They don't have opt out. They have a shopping list of default limits. So, it's not one but it's a few choices. So, they've moved to those because what they were finding is that I think 90 percent of players wanted to just pick from a list. And only a small percentage wanted to set a very specific dollar amount.

I'm trying to think of the other recommendations. I think pretty much everything other than opt out and a preset default limit.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I talked about this a little bit with Mark. My sense is the logic of the idea is really hard to argue with. It seems like offering people an opportunity to control their utilization of this system on a voluntary basis makes all the sense in the world. And the way you couch it in sort of a philosophic economic structure and pointing out that we have similar systems in other aspects of our lives that we tend to have a hard time controlling is very persuasive and interesting.

I agree with Commissioner McHugh
that some of the particulars like the default
limit, like I wrestle with the idea of
restraining people's ability to change their
mind to change their limit. I'm not sure what
right we have to do that. And I'm troubled by
the idea of having the operator reward people
for not playing. That seems so counter
systemic and counterintuitive. But be that as

it may, conceptually I think it's a very persuasive structure.

What troubles me is that as best I can tell there is not a single model out there where the system has operated with the conditions approximately similar to ours where we have any information about what's happened.

We have the one model in Queensland, which was a trial. We might have data if we can learn what's going on in New Zealand and if we can learn what's going on in the 49 venues in Queensland maybe we will have some real data.

But at this moment in time, we would be the first jurisdiction in the world, not the United States, but the world that we know of to really implement this on a go-forward basis with zero, basically zero actual data. And do we want to be the first ones who do that?

There are apparently BC, British

Columbia is going to institute a system, you
said in here I think pretty soon starting next
year that's quite similar to ours. There are

New Zealand and Queensland.

There are number of them that are 1 2 teed up to be the first out there that in a way 3 quite similar to what you are proposing for us. 4 So, besides the particular details that I have 5 trouble with, what I'm wrestling with and my 6 mind is totally not made up on this is should we wait a year or two and let these three or 8 four or five jurisdictions out there that are 9 really doing pretty much what we're talking 10 about and use the benefit of their experience? Or should we be the first ones out of the block 11 12 to do that?

MS. GLYNN: I think we would say that you have enough information to know that it's valuable and it can be made effective.

With conviction to the operator who raises the question of it costs X and the uptake is so low it's not worth -- the cost-benefit thing that they came up with at the last meeting, how can you say with the conviction that there is enough utilization of the system to rationalize the cost?

MS. GLYNN: What would be enough

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 utilization to rationalize \$50- to \$200,000 a 2 year across a casino of 2500 machines? 3 Well, it's 1200 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 4 we're talking about here. But I don't know. 5 There's an economic analysis, but play that 6 out. If the uptake is one percent, which seems like a pretty reliable minimum because we know 8 you can get one percent, what are the economics 9 of that? 10 MS. GLYNN: I would say that one 11 percent is the minimum. One percent is 12 jurisdictions that instituted the program with 13 very little energy. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I understand that. 15 But we don't know of a single other system that 16 has gone above one percent on an --17 MS. GLYNN: -- on an ongoing basis, 18 we know of trials, two-year trials. Yes, to 19 the 13 to 28 percent range. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 21 MS. GLYNN: I think one of the 22 things you need to do is to think about what is 23 enough? How many players could be helped 24 through this program that would be enough?

1 What would your gambling population be estimated at here in the state of 2 3 Massachusetts? 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Rachel, everybody? 5 MS. GLYNN: How many adults? 6 Casinos are usually 30 to 40 percent of the 7 population. So, let's do 30 percent of five 8 million. Does anyone have a calculator? 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thirty percent of 10 five million is 1,500,000. 11 MS. GLYNN: So, if you help one 12 percent of them and they manage their finances 13 better and their families aren't affected by 14 the impact, I would warrant that even at one 15 percent it's valuable and worth doing. But you can achieve so much more than one percent. 16 17 That's jurisdictions that have done it badly. 18 MR. VANDER LINDEN: I would arque 19 that this is one element that we have a lot of 20 control over, the level of uptake. And I think 21 that we already have pieces in motion that 22 would encourage a much greater uptake than 23 jurisdictions that did a poor rollout of this 24 type of program.

MS. GLYNN: Think of that for a moment, one percent did you say it was 1.5 So, one percent of 1.5 million at a cost of a licensing fee of \$50- to \$200,000 a year could be help to manage their gambling spend more responsibly that's compelling. a public health perspective, that's very compelling.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But that drives me back to how you define success. And you didn't define success -- And this is part of my struggle, although intuitively as I said I still believe this is a useful thing to have. You define success as a tool that people found useful subjectively, not a tool that produced a result. And now it seems to me you're shifting into result.

MS. GLYNN: Well, the whole area of how you would evaluate this system is one that we do speak to a little bit in the report. And I would argue that you would need to sit down and have some hard objectives. You would.

So, not just yes, I thought was useful. But I do agree that you would want to

have some harder objectives that talked about impact beyond just whether or not the person felt they were maintaining limits better.

You asked me what is successful, and I didn't say did they feel they were valuable that they were valuable. So, what is successful is that tools are valuable to players.

And how you determine what that value is part of it is going to be intellectually are they more aware of their spend? And part of it Is going to be much more subjective, how is it affecting their lives? Is gambling representing a more manageable part of their lives? What kind of impact is it having on their relationships?

I would argue that yes, you would want to for your entire Responsible Gaming Framework, and I believe you do have those kinds of measurements that are going to be taken in your population to see whether or not the population feels healthier about gambling, more positive toward gambling, healthier in terms of families and relationships.

So, I wasn't saying it's just do
they feel good about using the tool. I was
saying does it have to have value for the
players.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I didn't
understand that.

MS. GLYNN: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I'm sure you were clear and I misunderstood. But then we don't have data now to know whether these tools are going to yield that kind of substantive result, right?

MS. GLYNN: If substantive is that that small percentage that uses it even at the most minimum promotion or lack thereof, and in those cases muddied implementation that shifted from six-month to six-month or as elections came and went, even if you look at those minimal numbers and all you have achieved is helping that percentage of gamblers to gamble in a way that is more explicitly what they wanted to do, then I still think that's a tremendous social good.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes, it does.

1 MS. GLYNN: So, if you said as a 2 Commission we will only be successful if we 3 achieve these other outcomes, because I am 4 anticipating that as part of your Responsible Gaming Framework there will be targets. 5 6 these will be measured through the research that the team at UMass is doing in terms of 8 sort of community wellness, as well as some 9 very tangible economic figures, I would argue 10 that this would be a large contribution to that framework in terms of impact. 11 12 Of all the things you are talking 13 about in your Responsible Gaming Framework, 14 this one is one of the most powerful tools 15 based on what we have read and what we have 16 seen and what we have heard. 17 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I hear you. 18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What about the 19 notion of a trial, I didn't see that in the 20 recommendations like many other jurisdictions 21 have done. 22 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Could you give 23 me an example? 24 MS. GLYNN: Do you mean one of your

facilities?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right, right, or a subset of some machines. It occurs to me that many of these jurisdictions made some mistakes and had some recommendations because as they went through it. And some of them went through it on a trial basis, work out the kinks along the way.

MS. GLYNN: I think if you did that, you are potentially putting -- You have a built-in trial frankly. You have one facility that's going to open at least two years before any others. That's your trial.

But if you have one doing it and one not, you've created a competitive imbalance.

So, if you want to use your first facility opening as your trial and reserve the right to decide whether you roll it out across the remaining operators that would be operationally wise. But I would not have a situation where some of your facilities are required to do it while others aren't.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And that was to my point about New England, two of them in

Connecticut with the same driving distance to a lot of the population here in Massachusetts will not have it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But doesn't the fact that it's voluntary negate that?

MS. GLYNN: I honestly believe that if you position this well -- The jurisdictions that are now rolling it out, BC it's being called a benefit of loyalty membership that we give you these tools. They are not positioning this as anything negative at all. If you sign up for our loyalty program, you get all of these things and we give you these budgeting tools and they're great.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Just to reiterate, I've said to some of our operators that I think there's a potential win for an operator to lead. This is the only -- This is the criticism that is the most compelling of this industry. If this industry could neutralize or substantially neutralize this criticism, I think it would go a long way towards advancing in the long run the interest of the industry. And I think an operator could be a hero in

1 | leading the way here.

2 MS. GLYNN: I would allow your 3 operators to take all of the credit.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: For sure. But if it's going to be imposed by us, if they don't come to that same conclusion, it's just -- It is an opportunity. We've talked about this.

And we've talked with our operators about this. It is an opportunity for us to do a real sine qua non trial. We have a trial opportunity coming up, as you said. But do we want it to be we who are the first out of the box?

MS. GLYNN: But you're not. You're

MS. GLYNN: But you're not. You're coming out of the box with the benefit of everyone else's experience.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But we also have to be clear about what we're trying to achieve. If you take a look at the automobile industry, for example, when safety seatbelts, roll bars, all of this other kind of stuff was initially promulgated through government regulation, there was resistance to it. And soon, not soon but over a period of time, the automobile industry came to begin to tout

safety as a selling device. And it caught on and it increased sales.

So, it seems to me that your point is well taken. But it seems to me we have got to be clear about what we're trying to do. And if we're trying to find something that is useful to the player and market this as a voluntary thing that may be useful to players that's one thing that seems to me to be an easy sell.

But on page 15 of your report, you said that at one venue participants who set limits reported a 40 percent reduction in spending compared to those who did not set limits. If we're trying to reduce spending and that's the goal, then it seems to me we have got a very different kind of regime and a very different kind of objective that may not be consistent with the operator's ability or desire to market this as a useful thing to get people to come.

So, it seems to me from a whole host of standpoints, we really need to be clear about what we're trying to do and then devise a

1 | program that will accomplish that goal.

MS. GLYNN: I absolutely agree with you. I really do. When we talk about evaluation, it starts at the beginning. You

5 can't evaluate if you don't articulate upfront.

Yes, we would like to do this. And let's start to drill down to what we think it will achieve.

And we didn't do that in this report. We didn't drill deeper than those high-level objectives that I spoke of. But as part of an evaluation strategy, one of the jurisdictions said have that evaluation and data analytics plan ready upfront.

So yes, I agree that you would need your staff to work at saying these are the kinds of objectives that we're going to target to achieve. And then we're going to have every feature line up with those objectives because that's what you're saying about the default limits is are they consistent with the positioning?

And I agree that you need to take care with that. You need to be very clear that

these are the objectives you're trying to
achieve. It's probably more about a sense of
wellness around gambling, a sense of having
participated freely and actively. And being as
happy when they left as they were when they
came in.

Those are the kinds of things you're going to want to get at. And those are the kind of things you're going to want to measure. And you're going to want your objectives to line up with that, the features of the system to line up with that and the evaluation design.

So, I do agree and I do think you have to wrestle with those two elements that you've identified as sensitive. And if you're going to do them, then you need to be very careful about your education, your promotion and your positioning and the way that you evaluate against those objectives at the end of the day.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I noticed too the same thing that Commissioner McHugh said about the 40 percent reduction in spending. This is one of the things about being first out of the

box with the full-blown program.

If that 40 percent reduction in spending was a consequence of taking at-risk gamblers and having them not move down the continuum towards problem gambling because they were able to control. And by controlling they reduce their gambling by 40 percent that's a consequence, and although that might be tough for the industry, I'd be comfortable with.

If it's because the devices were an annoyance and they hated it and they went out and went to the one in the other state, I would not be happy with that.

MS. GLYNN: Or if it's because they think you're trying to collect too much data.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. And we don't know that. And we do have the ability to find out. As you said, we have a very, very good research team here and a big research budget. And we could find out whether this really will work or not. And are the suppositions that are built into this right or not.

But if there are unintended

consequences like that 40 percent is for exogenous reasons not actually saving people going down the continuum, then we will have done real damage to the industry in our experiment, in our trial.

If other people had done it, if we really knew what happened in New Zealand or in Queensland or in any of these other places with a full-blown mature trial, then we would not be imposing that element of risk by having the trial be ours. That's where I'm wrestling with.

Anybody else? I think you did an extremely thoughtful job, Judith. Under rigorous questioning, you are articulate and thoughtful. I think you articulate the very best of the theory and to the extent that there is practice on this. And I commend you for that. And I commend you Mark for doing it.

It's a big important challenging issue. I hope the press is paying attention because this conversation probably has never happened in any other gaming commission in the United States. I am proud of you guys for

1 helping us have it.

We decided to have at least a twoweek period of comment as we so often do. We
are inviting our operators or anybody else to
comment on this. Mark is taking the lead. It
is his job to come up ultimately with the
recommendation. And I know he's wrestling on
this. He will incorporate whatever feedback we
get over the course of the next week to 10
days.

And then perhaps as soon as the sixth, which is where it's presently intended,

Mark will come back with a recommendation. And
we will see what we can come up with.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I just echo that. I was aggressive in the questioning and it is because I am fascinated by this topic. I think it's as an important topic as we are taking up. And it is really great to have a thoughtful, many thoughtful observers and researchers here to present this. And I too think this is a terrific report and grateful for it.

MS. GLYNN: Thank you. I wish you

1 had been able to be there when Lia and Alex and 2 Karen, when the four of us were having these teleconferences over and over again and teasing 3 4 through and working through, because you 5 would've heard your concerns and heard us work 6 through them. It was a wonderful process. 7 grateful for the opportunity. 8 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If there is, by 11 the way, any opportunity to get any more data 12 from New Zealand or Queensland that would be 13 all to the good. 14 MS. GLYNN: And Singapore and 15 Norway, they're all prepared to --16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, Norway is a 17 mandatory, right? 18 Although they've MS. GLYNN: Yes. 19 done some really unique things with what the 20 limits should be which we will learn. 21 An interesting tiny little aside, 22 they had a sliding bar. Everyone wanted to be 23 in the middle. So, now they're trying to 24 gather data on what would be normative levels

for gambling. So, I think there's stuff to be learned from those jurisdictions and we will continue to gather it.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: May I recommend that we have a one-week period for comment and then that would allow me adequate time to review the comments to bring this back with a recommendation on the sixth?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Most of our operators are here. Hank, you might want to make sure we send it out widely that we're looking for comments in the next week on this issue.

Thank you very much. It's really fascinating.

16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

MS. GLYNN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. It is quarter to one. I think what we're going to do is take a lunch break. We have I think -- Is 45 minutes enough? We would start at 1:30. Do you want to make it an hour? We lose most people in the afternoon anyway. Let's make it 1:30. We'll be back here at 1:30. Thanks

1 everybody.

(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Folks we are ready to reconvene at about 1:30 public meeting number 137. We will pick up again with Director Mark Vander Linden on research and problem gaming.

Before we do that, we thought again and talked to Mark about the timing of comment period on the report that we just entertained before lunch and agree that it would be better to give a couple of weeks. So, we'll have a two-week comment period. And then Mark's recommendation will be as soon as two weeks after that. So, again if you could get that word out, Hank that it's a two-week comment period rather than one. It's an important enough issue. We want to make sure everybody has a chance to be heard.

Item 5(b) is draft credit checks,

ATM and bank card regs., Attorney Grossman and

Mr. Vander Linden.

1 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Good afternoon.

So, as you said we are bringing back before you the credit regs. that would include the acceptance for checks, procedures for establishing patron credit accounts, patron request for suspension of credit privileges and

automatic teller machines.

And while we're putting this under the problem gambling agenda item, I think that that's absolutely accurate because it's reflected -- much of what is reflected in the Responsible Gaming Framework is also reflected in the document that's before you now. But it also includes obviously a number of other items that would address this issue.

The feedback that we got for this even thus far for the framework would come from some of our licensees through the Massachusetts Partnership for Responsible Gaming. We also received comments from the AG's office and have had a couple of meetings with them.

So, with that we can talk about some of the key points of it. We can also just open it up for discussion if you have any pointed

1 questions.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm open to 3 suggestions. From my standpoint it'd be 4 helpful. I haven't had a chance to read it 5 closely. But it would be interesting to know 6 what you all think are the highlights, in 7 particularly what you think are controversial 8 at this point. Any other suggestions? 9

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No that makes sense.

MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon, Commissioners. I will just walk you through what we believe some of the highlights to be. Of course, we can pause at any point for a deeper dive.

Ultimately though, I think it's important to consider the context that these appear in. We've separated these out from the internal control regulations but ultimately it's envisioned that these will be part of the internal controls in the filing. We separated them out given the heightened attention they've received over the course of the past year or so.

But ultimately, we would hope to merge them back together as we move forward with the internal controls which you'll hear a little bit more about later.

That being said, we've broken what we've colloquially referred to as the credit regulations out into a number of different sections. There is a general section that provides an overview of how checks and cash equivalents will be accepted and presented by patrons. And how what are referred to as counter checks or markers, we don't use the term marker, but that's what they're colloquially referred to as, are processed and what the procedure for that is.

And we require that the gaming licensee establish processes and procedures for all of those things in a general sense. I thought I would just note at this point though that the statute, it's section 27F requires that the Commission collaborate with the Department of Transitional Assistance, Labor and Workforce Development and Housing and Community Development in a number of areas that

2.1

are relevant here.

So, this depending upon where we go from here today will be the time where we probably want to initiate some contact with those agencies to get their input here. As there are a number of provisions in here that by statute we are obliged to coordinate with those other entities on.

Such as the cashing of government issued checks and things of that nature, ensuring that EBT cards can't be used in the casino, all of those areas the statute says we work with the other agencies to collaborate to ensure that there are good regulations in place to prevent some of those things from happening.

We talk about on page two, for example a section on the redemption, substitution and consolidation of counter checks. So, we start with the issuance of counter checks then we move to how you go about redeeming them, substituting them or consolidating them in the event that you have more than one outstanding. We require here that the gaming licensee again come up with a

process and protocol for all of those things happening.

In here, they're fairly general. We don't get into a lot of particulars about how that needs to be done. And a lot of that issue will kind of meld into a later conversation about the internal controls in the discussion about how prescriptive we want to be when it comes to these types of areas.

Do we want to prescribe exactly how you go about redeeming a check? Or do we want to say to the gaming licensee that you need a procedure relative to redeeming checks? And it's finding a comfortable place that we're going to need to get to.

As we move onto section 42, the bottom of page two top of page three, we get into the acceptance of payments on outstanding counter checks and how coming up with a policy and procedure for doing that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I go back to a previous section as it seems like you are going to walk us through a few of these.

24 What's the thought behind debit card cash

transactions being precluded?

MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. I'm glad you brought us back to that. I scrolled a little too far. So, this is -- What Commissioner Zuniga is referencing is on the top of page two. It's paragraph 10. This is one of the general provisions we have included in the standard policy and procedures for the issuance of counter checks.

And this derives from the Problem Gambling Framework. This was one of the provisions that the Commission looked at in a general sense. And this represents the regulatory form of something you looked at in the framework.

It's highlighted here so that you could get a close look at it and understand exactly how it fits into the regulatory structure. And what this does is that it would preclude the acceptance of either credit cards or debit cards essentially at the cage in the gaming area. And it would require the gaming licensee to come up with processes and protocols to ensure that they are precluded.

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That they are 2 what? 3 MR. GROSSMAN: Precluded that they 4 can't be used. 5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: At the cage? 6 MR. GROSSMAN: Anywhere in the 7 gaming area, but it's at the cage effectively 8 that we're talking about. So, that's what it would look like and that's what the effect of 9 10 your review of the Problem Gambling Framework looks like. 11 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Then I quess I 13 didn't fully understand that because nine says 14 -- Why doesn't 10 swallow up nine? 15 MR. BAND: Nine has to do with automatic teller machines, which can be located 16 17 within 15 feet of the casino floor. So, it's 18 not on the gaming floor itself. 19 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But 10 says you can't have a credit card transaction --20 21 MR. BAND: -- in the gaming area. 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Ten says 23 credit card cash transaction or debit card cash 24 transaction anywhere in the place, right?

```
1
                MR. BAND:
                           No.
                                It says gaming area.
 2
     Gaming areas is that that actually encompass
 3
     the casino cage and stuff. Nongaming area is
 4
     where you'd go to the hotel, restaurants that
     kind of --
5
 6
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But still the
 7
     gaming establishment.
8
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I don't need
9
     to stop us now. I may want to talk about that
10
     further.
11
                MR. GROSSMAN: We may need to
12
     clarify nine. That applies to the whole gaming
13
     establishment, 10 just to the gaming area.
14
     That was the intent anyway.
15
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I see, I see
16
    what it is. Okay, thank you.
17
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But under 10,
18
     a patron could presumably pay a meal or the tab
19
     in the gaming area with a credit card, right?
20
                MR. VANDER LINDEN:
                                    Yes.
21
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Because it's a
22
     credit card cash transaction, cash advance
23
     that's precluded, not the use of credit cards
24
     altogether.
```

```
1
                MR. GROSSMAN: That's something we
 2
     would need to clarify. The way this is
3
     written, you couldn't use a credit card in the
 4
     gaming area.
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What does credit
5
6
     card cash transaction mean?
 7
                MR. GROSSMAN: We define that term
8
     actually in a different section.
9
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I actually
10
     thought it meant only take cash, cash advances.
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: You can get a
11
12
    burger but not cash.
13
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right,
14
     exactly.
15
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
                                       That's
16
     accurate?
17
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's the
18
     intention.
19
                COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You don't
20
    want to get a $500 cash advance off your credit
21
     card in the gaming area.
22
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The intention
23
     is a patron cannot use their credit card in the
24
     gaming area to get cash, but they can use their
```

credit card to pay for a burger.

MR. GROSSMAN: In the general sense,

there's nothing that's intended to preclude

there's nothing that's intended to preclude using your credit card for any nongaming type things. I think that's the intent.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: That's accurate to me.

MR. GROSSMAN: I think one of the more interesting places where we have a lot of good language is on page four. It's the establishment of the patron credit account. And the standards and some of the considerations that go into that determination are listed here in paragraphs (A) through (G).

The first two, essentially (A) and (B), set out the standard, if you will. And they talk about credit worthiness and ensuring that credit is not extended to an individual in an amount beyond that which the information reviewed demonstrates they have a reasonable ability to pay. So, we set up essentially a standard for the licensees to apply when issuing credit.

It may be that this is essentially

the standard that is used generally, though we weren't able to find it written in this way in other jurisdictions. But we thought it would be helpful to have some actual language here in these regulations.

Paragraph © or section (C) is also a provision that was migrated over from the Responsible Gaming Framework. And that is that credit will only be extended to patrons who qualify for a minimum threshold of \$10,000 and will not exceed the amount requested by the patron. So, that's an important provision as well.

It doesn't mean that someone has to take \$10,000 just that they have to be deemed qualified to receive \$10,000 to ensure that the lower amounts or people who would only qualify for lesser amounts wouldn't be extended credit of course. So, that's important.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Where does the \$10,000 come from? I understand the concept. How did we get the number?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: It was an issue that was discussed during the Partnership for

1 Responsible Gaming. It was a recommendation 2 that came from that group. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, that's 4 something the operators support? 5 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes. 6 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right, 7 This is an opportunity just to see if I 8 understand a premise underlying all of these check things correctly. In this world, as I 9 10 understand it, checks are often used as 11 security for house credit, right? 12 I mean normally you'd give a check 13 to somebody. And you'd anticipate the check to 14 be cashed and in return you'll get something 15 from it. 16 Here in this world, as I understand 17 it, the check often is a means of establishing, 18 getting some house credit. So, you give a 19 check for \$10,000 and you get 5000 or 3000 in 20 cash. And they hold the check until you pay 21 the \$3000 back. 22 Most of the time if you MR. BAND: put a check for 10,000 down that would be 23 24 considered a cash deposit in these regs. And

1 you can draw right on that deposit at the cage 2 from a table or whatever. 3 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But the check 4 would not necessarily be cashed. 5 MR. BAND: No, at the end of the day 6 you would have the right to redeem that if you wanted. It could eventually be deposited. 7 8 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I understand 9 that. 10 MR. BAND: But you have the 11 opportunity to redeem the check if you have the 12 funds to do so. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And do these 14 regulations say how long the operator must hold 15 the check? 16 MR. BAND: They have to have a 17 policy, but it cannot be longer than 30 days. 18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So, they could 19 hold it for 30 days and give you 30 days to 20 redeem it? 21 MR. BAND: Yes. 22 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I have a 23 question because you're talking about item ©,

credit will only be extended to the patrons who

- 1 | qualify for a minimum threshold of \$10,000.
- 2 Are we talking within a specific time period or
- 3 is it that one time request for the minimum
- 4 threshold?
- 5 MR. BAND: That would be when they
- 6 | initially set up credit. It would be based on
- 7 that. They would check and see if they
- 8 | actually qualified for that amount. You might
- 9 only ask for 3000 in credit but you would have
- 10 to qualify for that \$10,000 threshold.
- 11 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: The timeline
- 12 in terms of that's my one-shot deal or is that
- 13 | a weekly basis, monthly basis?
- 14 MR. BAND: No. It would be as long
- 15 as you have credit there or ask for an increase
- 16 or decrease or whatever.
- 17 | COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.
- 18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Just to pick
- 19 up on that would this house credit against a
- 20 | \$10,000 check be covered?
- MR. BAND: It's not actually house
- 22 | credit. What you're doing is drawing on that
- 23 deposit that you put in there. At the end, you
- 24 can buy that check back if you have sufficient

funds do so. So, you're not really drawing on credit if you put a cash check in.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I see. That's not considered a credit transaction. It's considered a cash --

MR. BAND: It's a cash deposit.

MR. GROSSMAN: The term credit, it seems as someone who is somewhat new to this is somewhat of a misnomer. This is not really credit per se as we all understand it. It's really you have cash there that they let you use.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are there standards that determine creditworthiness or who has the ability to get credit up to 10,000 or is that part of what we would be reviewing? Where do those standards come from?

MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that comes down a little further on. And we talk about what has to go into the creation of a credit file. This starts on page five. We go into some of the sources of information that the gaming licensee has to use.

And then they have to verify certain

information. And we go into a little bit about how they have to go into verifying certain pieces of information.

So, essentially they have to create a whole credit file on an individual in which they are able to document why they did decide to extend credit to an individual and then in what amount.

There's also a provision that talks about derogatory information, which we actually define in the internal controls regulations as essentially things like bounced checks and other types of bad things. So, that if they decide to issue credit to someone who has derogatory information that they explain why they did it. Perhaps someone bounced a check by mistake. So, it wasn't a big deal. They cleared it up shortly thereafter whatever it is.

The regs. do require that a process and an infrastructure be put in place to address the gathering of certain information.

A thoughtful decision as to whether to issue credit and then how they go about paying it

1 And then we get into a little further 2 down how the gaming licensee would go about 3 collecting a debt if in the event the check 4 bounces essentially. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 6 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I'm sorry. 7 Can I go back to page 4 letter F, the credit 8 application will include the problem gambling 9 self-assessment. Who's coming up with that 10 self-assessment? 11 MR. VANDER LINDEN: There's a 12 standard assessment that I would recommend 13 called the BBGS, brief biopsycho. social 14 It's a three question assessment assessment. 15 that's been widely accepted, tested, evaluated. 16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It's more of 17 once again, right before you sign that credit 18 application, ask yourself these questions. 19 doesn't involve necessarily the licensee's staff. 20 21 MR. VANDER LINDEN: No. 22 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I would 23 think we would want to be more prescriptive

than a problem gambling self-assessment.

1 | we've identified what it is, put it in there.

2 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Sure. I think 3 we can add that easily.

MR. GROSSMAN: Along those lines, we have added some language in here about certain disclosures that have been made as part of the credit application. Those are on the top of page six.

Mr. Chair, just to pick up on part of your question, the credit file and the information looked at looks at such things as the individual's residence, current casino credit limits, outstanding balances, outstanding indebtedness, and personal checking account information, verification of all those items.

We talk about the implementation process by which credit will be approved. Who is going to approve it. What type of sign-offs do you need. And the same as there are parallel requirements that they put in place, provisions for the increase in one's credit line and how often that can be done.

On the bottom of page 13, we get

into data collection. Essentially, we say they
have to keep a log of all of the counter checks
and slot counter checks that they have
outstanding.

We get into on the bottom of page 15 the suspension of one's credit privileges.

This is a voluntary process. Similar to the process by which one would exclude themselves from the casino altogether, we require a process be put in place where one could exclude themselves from receiving credit or having their account shut down. The corollary is that there are procedures in place as to how they could reestablish their account once they decide they want to open it back up.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So, this is similar to the self-exclusion in that it could be tiered? I could sign up for one year, for three years?

MR. GROSSMAN: This is not quite as detailed as that. This is more basic. And we just say -- We certainly could go down that road.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: There are not

1 set prescribed times or a menu of timespans 2 that somebody could choose from. It's more 3 general than that. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Why not? You've 5 got self-exclusion that has time, why is there 6 no time associated with the credit exclusion? MR. VANDER LINDEN: I didn't see any 8 precedent for that in any other jurisdiction. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That never held 10 you back before. MR. VANDER LINDEN: That's a very 11 12 great point. We could certainly use the same 13 timeframes. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Just for the same 15 reason that a self-exclusion does have time 16 associated with it, it seems kind of odd to not 17 have it -- It seems like very much the same 18 principle trying to support people who know 19 they've got a problem and are volunteering for 20 help. Why would you have time associated with 21 one and not the other? It just doesn't make 22 sense. 23 So, you'll look at that? Okay. 24 MR. VANDER LINDEN: I certainly

will.

MR. GROSSMAN: And just to pick up on something we talked about before, it was the top of page 18 we get into the procedure for depositing of checks, consolidation and redeeming of checks, some of the particulars there. The correction of any mistakes that are recorded on some of these counter checks.

The bottom of page 19 gets into the debt collection practices. We cross-reference the Attorney General's debt collection regulations. And say that essentially those have to be followed.

We add in here at the top of page 20, we say that a gaming licensee's debt collection policy shall not allow for placement of a lien on a patron's primary residence.

That was an issue that came up a while back.

So, we explicitly mention that.

And then the last provision we have on page 22 deals with ATMs. We essentially cross-reference the Division of Bank's statutes and regulations and make clear that those have to be followed. Then again incorporate one of

1 the provisions that was found in the 2 Responsible Gaming Framework that says that 3 ATMs shall be located -- shall not be located 4 closer than 15 feet from the gaming area in the 5 gaming establishment -- No ATMs shall be 6 located within 15 feet. So, that is kind of a 7 broad overview of what we have in here. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me, Todd. The Division of Banks is okay with that 9 10 standard? 11 MR. GROSSMAN: That issue is still 12 somewhat outstanding as to whether ATMs will be 13 allowed in gaming establishment at all. You'll 14 recall there is a provision in the banking 15 statute that talks about the location of what 16 they refer to as electronic branches, which 17 include ATMs in places where legalized gambling 18 That provision was placed in the law 19 20 years ago or so. And we are still working 20 to determine how that will be interpreted. 21 So, this would be kind of a subset of that. There is still a chance that one 22 23 could interpret the banking statutes to

preclude ATMs altogether. But assuming that's

1 not the approach that is taken, this would fit 2 neatly in there. 3 To answer your question directly 4 though, they haven't signed off on this. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And they won't 6 think we've assumed it. You're in touch with them? 8 MR. GROSSMAN: I have mentioned that 9 this is something that was in the framework. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Where did the 15 11 feet come from? 12 MR. BAND: It was originally 100 13 And having seen some of Penn's plans, 14 that would have us out in the parking lot some 15 place being 100 feet away. So, I thought to be 16 reasonable to give them some space where they 17 would be able to have an ATM if they wanted off 18 their floor. 19 MR. VANDER LINDEN: It was also an issue that was discussed in the MPRG, Mass. 20 21 Partnership, meetings. And I think 22 specifically we discussed 100 feet. We

discussed that, exactly as Bruce had said,

would not facilitate -- not be reasonable and

23

1 | we came up with 15 feet.

The idea is that it's not in the gaming area. That it's off that it allowed somebody to actually get up to go to think about whether or not they're going to access more cash for gambling purposes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay, if you're fine with that. Any other questions, comments? All right. Thank you very much. So, where are we in the process? What happens next with these regs.?

MR. GROSSMAN: I think we might be able to gain some clarity after we talk about the internal control regs., which are coming up at some point in the not-too-distant future.

So, we can talk about everything together and whether you'd like to move different pieces at different times or if you wanted to do the whole thing together.

As I mentioned, this is part of the internal controls. So, if you elect to move the internal control document, which you have before you, ahead today for example, this would be done separately. I suppose in keeping with

- past practice, you would want to allow a period
  of informal comment on these credit regs.
  before we start moving them through the formal
  process. In which case, we would just move
  these separately from the remainder of the
  internal control regulations.
  - Or if you were to hold off on the rest of the internal controls, we could move everything together.
- 10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Is there an urgency?
  - MR. BAND: We're just starting today. We got our first comments on the internal controls. And I understand group one possibly coming to comment on it. It would probably be beneficial for us to look at those comments prior to moving it ahead.
  - COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Is it purely procedures? I'm thinking about Penn. It's three weeks. If we wait a couple of weeks, we're likely into January before we finalize the internal control and these regulations.
- MR. BAND: They have been working on the draft to implement it into their system. I

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

think if we had it by the end of January that would not be a big problem for them. I've been in constant communication.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Come on up, Lance.

MR. GEORGE: Bruce is correct. Rick asked me that question yesterday. From our regulatory folks, in a perfect world 12/31, drop-dead date of 1/31 for us. So, the end of January works.

MR. DAY: And I think part of the process here is and I think Bruce kind of mentioned it is the credit sections make sense to go ahead and put it up for informal public comment because otherwise it sort of gets lost in the huge product of the internal controls themselves.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. For the reason that you pulled them out to begin with, I think that does make sense. Thank you, Lance.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I make one quick comment. On page 16, we write that the Commission shall maintain a list of the credit. It's probably a little ideology, but I prefer

- 1 every time that we write something that the 2 Commission will do to be a may. We will do it, 3 but I don't want to write shall in regulations. 4 Of course, we'll maintain it. MR. VANDER LINDEN: Similar to the 5 6 self-exclusion, the casino self-exclusion list, I would want to go back to make sure we could 8 see that that language is consistent between 9 those. Because we are responsible for 10 maintaining that master list. It should look 11 similar to the credit suspension. 12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I should have 13 mentioned unless it's a specific directive in 14 the statute. If it is, of course, shall fits 15 just fine in deference to the statute. But if 16 it isn't, I just wanted to mention that. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay, great.
- 17
- 18 Thank you very much. Now item number six,
- 19 Workforce, Supplier and Diversity Development
- 20 Director Jill Griffin.
- 21 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We haven't
- 22 been on all day.
- 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We haven't been on
- 24 all day? We're not streaming live?

Page 200 1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Not us, just 2 the documents. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What are you 4 saying? I can't hear what you're saying. 5 What's the issue here? 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Does the 7 stream carry just what's on that screen, Rob? 8 Is the live stream carrying only what's showing 9 up on that screen? 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, what we're 11 looking at is not the live stream? 12 AV TECH.: Yes, that is correct. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes, it is not. 13 14 Okay. 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes, it is 16 not. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Vote yes on no. 18 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: We want to 19 make sure everybody can see your lovely shining face. 20 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I have no idea 22 what we just did, but let's move along. 23 Director Griffin. 24 MS. GRIFFIN: Chairman Crosby,

Commissioners, as you all know themes of
economic and workforce development as well as
opportunity for the unemployed and
underemployed are woven throughout the gaming
law.

The law and our own regulations set a priority for diversity in all stages of the casino including design, construction and operations. In fact, 23K section 15 stipulates that each gaming licensee must formulate for Commission approval and abide by an affirmative action program of equal opportunity whereby the operator establishes specific goals for the utilization of minorities, women and veterans on the construction jobs.

Those goals need to be equal or greater to the goals contained in Administrative Bulletin number 14. That's 15.3 percent minority and 6.9 percent women. Section 3 of Administrative 14 says that the contractor shall strive to achieve the labor participation goals in each job category including bricklayers, carpenters, cement masons, electricians, ironworkers and so on.

At our last meeting, we had a presentation from Susan Moir from UMass Boston and Liz Skidmore from the Carpenters union.

They're both members of the policy group on tradeswomen's issues. And I think Susan is here today with us.

They presented best practices for achieving gender diversity during construction. So, on November 7 I will be presenting to you a recommendation that the Mass. Gaming Commission establish an Access and Opportunity Committee to both provide transparency regarding progress towards diversity and to recommend actions to increase the level of minority, women and veterans as employees and vendors during construction.

Unions are integral to the success of the diversity during construction.

Commissioners, I have representatives today from the Regional Council of Carpenters and the Building and Construction Trades Council.

These are unions that are leaders in diversity efforts and will be our partners on the ground.

So, I'd like to introduce you to

Mark Ehrlich to my immediate left, Executive
Secretary and Treasurer of the New England
Regional Council of Carpenters. And then to
his left Brian Doherty Secretary and Treasurer
and General Agent of the Building and
Construction Trades Council.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Welcome.

MR. ERLICH: Thank you. Mr.

Chairman, members of the Commission thank you

for listening to Brian and me today on this

critically important subject. I will talk a

little bit about my personal situation. I

joined the Carpenters Union in 1975, a long

time ago. I've got a lot of gray hair I didn't

have back then as well as a few other things.

It was a very different union back then. It was really kind of a father-son, uncle-nephew dynamic, and mostly comprised of white men. And diversity was not an issue that was either taken all that seriously or much of a priority at any level of the industry.

Fast forward, it's now 2014. It's a very different world. I've been the head of the New England Regional Council of Carpenters.

1 We cover the six New England states. We have 2 about 19,000 members. And we are, I can say 3 with a great deal of pride, a diverse union. 4 It is a very, very different union 5 than the one I joined. People are always 6 asking about statistics. Probably the most 7 reliable statistic that I think that we can 8 provide is by looking at our apprenticeship. 9 The membership data is actually not broken out 10 by race and ethnicity. The apprenticeship data because of the role of the state and the 11 12 federal government in apprenticeship training 13 is. 14 And if you look at our Boston area 15 locals, which sort of cover the geographic 16 district equivalent to the Boston SMSA, which 17 is about 35 percent minority, our 18 apprenticeship program is 35 percent minority. 19 So, we are what I would consider reflective of 20 the demographics. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is that the 22 apprenticeship program at this moment in time? 23 MR. ERLICH: At this moment in time.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How long has that

been the case?

MR. ERLICH: Ten years. And it's important to understand the value of apprenticeship statistics because that's the future. That's the future of the industry. We're in an interesting moment in time in the industry where because of the depth of the reception from 2008 to 2012, there was about four or five years of between 30 and 40 percent unemployment. Nobody new came into the unions.

There were no jobs. With that level of unemployment, you could barely keep the existing membership working. So, you had a whole group of people who aged that four or five years without being replaced by anybody incoming new, which means there's a tremendous opportunity now with the economic recovery that we're facing.

There will be people retiring. The workforce got four or five years older without any replacement and therefore the opportunities are there in an almost unprecedented way for the casinos and for all of the other construction that's going on. So, this is a

great time to be thinking about the issue of diversity.

We have 24 locals in New England, 13 in Massachusetts. And three of them are two African-American leaders, and one Latino head of the union. So, it's a completely different world than the Carpenters organization. We still have a long ways to go. Our numbers around the inclusion of women is not what we would like it to be. And there is more of a need for aggressive outreach and recruitment there.

But the difference is that the culture has changed from top to bottom.

There's an eagerness and willingness to reflect the demographics of the communities that we live and work in. I live in the city and have for all of my adult life. And I am committed to that on a personal basis.

So, I guess the real question then becomes well, what do you do? How do you make it happen? What are the impacts? You heard as a Commission from Susan and Liz about their best practices, which I think is probably one

1 of the better documents about nuts and bolts.

I will say this, I've been doing
this for a long time. I was on the Diversity
Compliance Committee with then Senator
Wilkinson for the Convention Center. I've been
doing this for many, many years. It is really
simple, which is that you put a laser like
focus on the issue from the beginning of the

job and you don't ever let it go.

And everybody who is involved from the general contractors to the subcontractors has to know that there is a carrot and a stick associated with having a diverse workforce.

That if they want to work on the Wynn Casino, if they want to work on the MGM Casino, this is part of the deal.

It comes with it. There's a commitment to a diverse workforce. And if you're not committed to that, if you're not interested in that then don't work here.

There's other work you can do. But if you're going to be part of a Gaming Commission project, then you have to be committed to that and have goals and standards. There are

metrics that are measured. And in some ways have compensation related to the ability to meet those goals and standards.

It is remarkable with all the discussion about color, in the industry the one that is green is the one that really drives people's decision-making. If you are going to get paid or not get paid, suddenly your behavior changes.

Going back to the Kroc Center with the Salvation Army that was an example of a job, of a private job where the ownership said from the beginning this is built in a community of color. The workforce has to reflect the communities of color. Everybody was told that. Every subcontractor was told that.

They were measured every single week. If they weren't in compliance, they had to fix it right away or payments were withheld. Guess what, the numbers were excellent. UMass Boston PLA same thing. It is really a question of riding herd.

And again, Susan and Liz's piece on best practices talks about the role of the

owners. It starts with the role of the general contractor. It starts with the role of the subs. Everybody has to have a set of steps in which they are held accountable to including us, including the union side.

If that happens, these goals are imminently achievable. And if it doesn't happen, they won't be met. It is really as simple and clear as that.

I work very closely with my friend Brian Doherty around these issues who is the same level of commitment. And he can describe the programs that he's come out of with the Building Pathways and what he's doing now with the building trades.

Between the two of us you have a very ringing commitment to the issue of transforming the construction industry workforce. It's long overdue. It's happening. It's underway. There's no reason why in this next decade we really can't make enormous strides. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Question,
Mark. I'm curious as to why you don't track

- 1 diversity numbers only with the apprentices.
- Why don't you track that information with the general membership?
- 4 MR. ERLICH: The membership database
- 5 | that we use is one that our International Union
- 6 | has developed. It covers the United States and
- 7 Canada. They designed it. I didn't. They
- 8 | don't have fields for race or ethnicity in it.
- 9 That's why I can't tell you. That's the
- 10 database we use.
- 11 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It does not
- 12 make a compelling argument that you're
- interested in this when you don't track the
- 14 information.
- MR. ERLICH: Again, I think you can
- 16 track it in terms of the apprenticeship because
- 17 | especially in the period of time now. That's
- 18 | the workforce of the future.
- 19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: How many
- 20 apprentices become full-time members? What's
- 21 | the percentage?
- MR. ERLICH: There's a churn factor
- 23 in the first year. Some people come in to the
- 24 | apprenticeship -- We try to do -- We are

1 getting better and better at screening and 2 preparing people. Some people think they're 3 going to work in this old house when they 4 decide to become a union carpenter. And they 5 find out that they're humping concrete forms in 6 the middle of three-degree weather in the winter. 8 So, it's not quite as attractive as 9 they thought it was going to be. So, we have 10 about a 25 to 30 percent dropout rate in the 11 first year. But after that, almost all of them 12 become journeyman. 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Do you track 14 the percentage of the 35 percent that make it 15 into the full membership? 16 MR. ERLICH: Yes. 17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And are the 18 numbers consistent? 19 MR. ERLICH: The churn factor is 20 about the same across-the-board. 21 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: With women and minorities? 22 23 MR. ERLICH: Maybe a little bit 24 higher. We are now beefing up our mentoring

program within the apprenticeship to make sure that people don't fall through the cracks so that they get the support.

It still can be, there's no other way to say it, on occasion a hostile work environment especially for a woman. Working to be one woman on a crew of 50 men can be a pretty tough situation. And there's real strong needs for support groups and mentoring to make sure that people can survive and thrive in that environment.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And you mentioned certain projects require a diverse workforce, which means certain projects don't.

MR. ERLICH: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Does that mean there is no effort there at all for those projects? Or is there an effort put into all of the projects even though it's not a requirement?

MR. ERLICH: As I'm sure you know, the projects that require are the Boston jobs ordinance, which covers all publicly funded jobs in the city and private jobs over 100,000

square feet. And then state-funded jobs have
their own goals that they try to meet.

If you were to talk about some
hospital in the suburbs that is built that the
ownership plays no part, then it's simply a
question that we supply a workforce that is

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

But there's no goals typically there.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good questions.

Welcome Brian.

MR. DOHERTY: Thank you. Mr.

Chairman, members of the Commission, thank you for this opportunity. I'd like to say thank you my colleague Mark Erlich. Mark is a pioneer in this campaign for diversity in the construction trades. I'm honored and privileged to be sitting next him and to actually learn from a lot of the efforts that he's put in place over his career. So, thank you Mark.

Just moving onto some of the stuff I wanted to mention today. Similar to Mark, I started my career right here in Boston 16 years ago. At the age of 18, I had an opportunity

after high school to join the Big Dig. It was a major time of looking for opportunity.

There was a big economic boom going on because of the Central Artery Tunnel project. I graduated high school on a Friday. I was working by Monday. I was very lucky. I was very fortunate to have that opportunity after applying to the Laborers Union in Boston, Local 223.

So, the reason -- I'd like to catch up to my career, just quickly the story that I want to tell today is the story of what unions do for families. My parents are immigrants in this country. They came separately. They came and they worked hard. And they were afforded an opportunity to join a union, my mother right here across the street for the International Longshoreman's Association on the waterfront where she worked very long hours, very hard manual labor as a young woman in this country. And she did that to make it and survive here.

When she did that she was given some decent wages, access to healthcare and a decent retirement if she chose to take it. She was a

young woman then working toward it.

My father, same situation, he joined the construction trades, was given the same benefits that a union career provides to you. They met, they married, they had eight children here in Boston, Massachusetts. They met in Roxbury.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Eight?

MR. DOHERTY: Eight children. I am very proud to say the my parents put eight kids through college because again they had access to decent wages. They had access to healthcare, which meant one of those children wasn't going to bankrupt them if they got sick. And they could put food on the table every night.

And because of economic opportunities that happened for them 50 years ago and 16 years ago for me and potentially more opportunities in 2014, we want that same story of no matter where you come from or who you are or what you look like, we want these economic opportunities to benefit everyone and their families. So, that's the position we're

1 taking at the Building Trades.

being enough done in diversity.

I've had the very fortunate

opportunity to learn from colleagues like Mark

Erlich, Mark Fortune, the President of the

Building Trades, my predecessor Martin Walsh,

Martin J. Walsh. He took over as mayor of the

city of Boston. And when he took over the

Building Trades, we saw that there was not

So, we immediately enacted campaigns to create stronger outreach through our apprenticeship programs. We created the Building Pathways program, which was essentially a campaign to go into every community, every part of the city, every part of this region to tell people if you want a career in construction, come get it.

It doesn't matter where you come from, what your background, the message is this, if you want a career in construction, come apply to our programs. That's the message and that's where we're taking this movement forward.

It's not that simple. And what we

1 had to do is we had to do a lot of outreach.

2 And I'm proud to say I was talking to Susan

3 | Moir, another colleague. And just to be clear,

4 I am the General Agent for the Building Trades,

5 which represents thousands of working families

6 in this Eastern Mass. region.

I am the former project coordinator for Building Pathways. And I am a current coconvener of the policy group on Trades Women's Issues with the Regional Council of Carpenters, the Building Trades, UMass Boston and some community groups. I'm sorry. Let me pull back UMass Boston. A professor at UMass Boston is a convener of that group.

So, three years ago, the Mayor took over the Building Trades said that he always had the attitude of we can do more for more people. So, immediately opened up more programming, more opportunities to make sure that there was a change.

And I recognize in the past 30 years this has been a white-male dominated industry. We are and have been to Mark's point making strident efforts to change that. And we have

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

kicked that into I would say high gear for the past three years.

We're very proud to say we've almost doubled the number of women in the city -- in the Eastern Mass. Region from the national average from three percent which it was plaguing the industry, but here in Boston we're between five and six percent. So, that is a major step because we've changed our policies. There are practices. There are best practices, which I think we should discuss today, that can lead to changes such as seeking women and the proactive steps it takes to let everyone know now is the time.

So, I just want to talk about a couple of things that had worked over the past few years. In my current term, I've been in the general agent's position for 15 months. what I've seen is jobs where workers are protected, project labor agreements are in place or some type of community benefit agreement. Access and opportunity committees are put in place or where there is some type of vehicle or conduit for everyone to come to the

same table and shine a light on all stakeholders' expectations.

There's been some room and some growth around good things happening. At UMass Boston they're meeting the Boston resident policy numbers for the first time on a project in the city that I can think of except the one Mark mentioned, the Kroc Center. And the best impact has happened on unionized sector or organized sector jobs.

This is not in any way a union versus nonunion conversation. This is a conversation about protecting all workers no matter what sector they're in. I can just state firmly that workers will be more protected when they have union representation or collective-bargaining agreements. So, I am very pleased to see a project labor agreement on this particular development.

Some of the things that we've also done have created as a building trades, we've reached out to all of the high schools in the city of Boston. We're reaching out to the high schools in the regional sector, which would be

the towns of Medford, Somerville, Chelsea,

Revere, Everett. Around the city of Boston as

you go out in concentric circles in trying to

regionalize the access and opportunities for

these programs.

Building Pathways has had some major success in the city. We've put over 125 people into the trades, half of which have been women, over 90 percent have been people of color. Four percent were at one time actually experiencing homelessness. So, some good things have happened.

But that vehicle that Building
Pathways project has been with my colleague
Susan Moir called the Anchor Conversation which
it gave everybody a chance to come and talk
about something very important to each
stakeholder, whether an elected official, a
constituent group, a community group, union
laborer, a contractor, a subcontractor,
academia, etc., you are coming to the same
table to put a focus on this important issue.

So, that has happened through a couple of efforts. Our training programs have

all opened their doors and increased their application -- I'm sorry. We have streamlined the application process. We've made it public for all application times, dates, who are the contact people. We've simplified the versions. We have created sensitivity training programs.

And I would just like to say that we are putting the steps in place to make this a fair equitable opportunity for everyone. If you can use this as an opportunity to promote the message, I do want to make clear the message is very simple, if you want a career in the Building Trades, the time is now to get it. Come apply to our programs, regardless of anything. Now is the time to apply to our programs.

So, I'm happy to answer questions or talk about best practices that we put in place. But would like to say thank you for your time. And thank you for letting us share as organized labor that we are here to do good things for every community, for every family, for every worker. That's our role in this. So, thank you.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Encouraged to hear about the ongoing kind of recruitment efforts and even kind of going down into the high schools and talking to people who might not have thought about this as a career until now.

And Brian as you just mentioned, kind of highlighting the sensitivity trainings that you're doing. It's great to recruit, but if they walk into that hostile work environment, all of your recruitment efforts are going to go out the window.

The question that's come up has been thinking about the appeal of these projects, again, from Springfield, the MGM project is going to be the biggest private construction project in Western Massachusetts in the history of the region.

Thinking about what should we be looking for maybe in terms of the apprentice participation, one to help increase the diversity numbers, but any other recommendations you would have for us in looking at that piece of the construction

1 project in terms a percentage of apprentices? Does that vary by region or by locale? 2 3 MR. DOHERTY: I think that's a fair 4 question. This is not a dodge in any way. 5 represent Greater Boston. I represent the 6 metropolitan area, which is a different demographic population than other parts of the 8 state. 9 They would be under the same 10 training programs and the same outreach 11 opportunities and the same numbers for 12 compliance goals. So, there is no reason none 13 of these goals should be met -- all of these 14 goals should be met on all of these projects. 15 I think putting a proactive plan in place from 16 day one until the time we hand the keys over to 17 the casino or whoever the end-user developer, 18 that is the type of commitment we need to see 19 these numbers stay and maintain a decent level 20 of percentages. 21 There was a question asked. And I 22 think it was a good question and a fair 23 question. It was do we track all jobs? 24 Something that we found because we are looking

at this in a very -- We have our partners in academia. We have our partners in our research departments. We're trying to drill down to see what's actually happening on these jobsites.

What we are trying to avoid -- What we're trying to promote is that any of our workers, they become part of a core crew.

Meaning that these compliance goals, they incentivize making sure we meet the numbers but they also incentivize what we call checker boarding or making sure that they're meeting the numbers, which means you might get six weeks on this project, six weeks on the next project. And you actually don't get the training you deserve by spending a full year or two years or three years.

So, when you come into one of our programs, we want you to have all of the onthe-job training you can receive plus all of the schoolwork and a full-time course load. But we want to see you make relationships with your contractor or subcontractor and you'll have a 30-year career out of it.

So, we want to avoid working toward

the numbers. We're working toward protecting the worker, making sure that every worker has the training and the opportunity necessary to have a fruitful career. So, when we don't track them on jobs, we are still promoting that they stay in that contractor base or in their company on their team, learning their skills.

I think it's a fair question but there are a few other best practices that we've done. Core crews being one of them creating some type of oversight committee such as Access and Opportunity just to continuing to shine the light on it and look for best practices.

At first glance it might seem that it would be appropriate to keep the numbers up on jobs, but the commitment from labor is the worker comes first. The worker should be in a position where they can do well for themselves and their family. And we've seen that keeping them in a good position or in a good environment is the best way to make that happen.

As far as percentages, we have increased them quite a bit. And we have a long

way to go. And I think it's going to take that
proactive nature to continue improving these
numbers. I don't know if that answers
directly.

MR. ERLICH: I can speak a little
bit to Springfield. We have Local 108 that
covers Western Massachusetts. Here in
Berkshire County, Springfield areas, I don't
know the exact numbers but it's a very diverse
membership out there. Probably in terms of
racial groups, maybe slightly less AfricanAmerican more Latino given the population that
exists in Springfield, Holyoke and Chicopee,

So, I am not concerned at all about, at least I don't know enough about the other trades, but with respect to our trade meeting the goals.

In terms of specific things that you can do, I can tell you what doesn't work. What doesn't work is saying, yes, yes, yes, we have these goals. They're on paper. They're in the contract. And then nobody pays attention to it. Then somebody comes along, a compliance

etc.

officer whether this is the city of Boston or whether it's the state or whoever it is, whoever the owner happens to be. And then six months into the job, says wait a minute the numbers are terrible.

Then there's a Chinese fire drill.

Everybody starts running around like crazy.

And everybody starts yelling at each other.

And it's important to remember in our business that the actual workers are primarily employed by the subcontractors and not the general contractor or construction manager. And that will be the case with the casinos for sure.

So, the onus is really on the subcontractors. Some of them are interested in changing the nature of the industry, and quite frankly some of them aren't. So, unless their feet are held to the fire -- So, what happens is the numbers are bad because they bring their usual workforce to the job. And their workforce is primarily white and primarily male.

And then someone tells them you're not meeting your goals. So, then they call up

the union. And they say send X, Y or Z to fill in whatever. And the job is already 80 percent done. And they're trying to sort of cover their reputation or parts of their anatomy in terms of not having been compliant from the beginning. And that's a disaster.

That's a disaster for everybody because people who are sent there recognize that they're only being sent there in order to meet goals and criteria. They're not necessarily treated with respect. It's not a comfortable work situation for anybody. And there's an enormous amount of resentment all over the place and it doesn't work.

What works is to tell the subcontractors from the beginning you start the first week of the job with a crew that is compliant with the numbers that we are trying to do. They should be part of your core crew, not fill-in folks that the union provides.

That's not the way to think about this. It's about ultimately transforming the industry and the people who move with those subcontractors from job to job to job.

You're in a position as a gaming commission with two massive projects to be able to set the tone for how this is going to be done. That tone has to be set both verbally and contractually from the beginning. And I would argue even more strongly there needs to be carrots and sticks for rewards or incentives and disincentives for people who are either compliant or noncompliant.

If there's a subcontractor in some trade who doesn't want to go along with that program that's fine. They just shouldn't be working in Springfield or in Everett. That's all. And I think you're in a position to really make that crystal clear along with the owners to say this is what we want. This is what we insist on. And here is the language in the contract that you're going to be held accountable for.

It's no different from saying I want the color of that wall painted a certain color. It's the same thing. It can be written into the contract. These are your goals. These are your specifications that you're required to

meet in order to get paid appropriately. It's remarkable what happens when language like that is in a contract.

MR. DOHERTY: If I may touch on it also. I think that a couple of things are very important here. I think political will is very important. I think the owner end-user needs to be from the top this while every level of this pyramid or every level the structure whether vertical or horizontal is saying the same thing. That this is important to both the unions, the contractors, the subs, pushing everybody at the same time.

Some simple steps to Mark's point, you have to come on the site with a diverse workforce to maintain that throughout the project. You can't play catch-up if you start on the wrong foot.

One of the simple things that a construction or any project management team will do is create a Gant chart that tells you when something is coming into a project. We can do the same thing for work hours. We can do the same thing. And when you have that work

hours, you are going to know that if you need 10 percent of 10 hours, you need at least one hour covered by someone that fits in that demographic.

You can break down the hours by what number of people you need on each crew coming into it. That could be something that's put into the bid specs so that you're focused just as much on having the material on-site as you are a workforce reflective of the efforts by the joint political capital.

Just this past year, two and a half months ago, Mark and I co-convened with all of the general contractors in this region, pretty much the big ones you can think of and the subcontractor base to do things in a responsible way.

We had a large first-ever building summit, which brought all of the folks that actually do the building of these projects into the same room. Because oftentimes what happens is you'll have the subcontractor blaming the general contractor, the general blaming the unions or the unions blaming subs or some

variation of a siloed conversation.

We are no longer interested in the siloed conversations, but bringing everyone to the same table to have bigger conversation which is there's something amiss right now.

How do we fix it?

Solutions based, solution oriented, eliminate the blame game, eliminate ways that you can get away or out of doing the diversity piece and just bring it into the same conversation. That's the first time it's ever happened.

There were over 300 subcontractors in the room with probably 12 or 14 biggest general contractors in Massachusetts in the room with all of organized labor and construction industry saying the same thing. Diversity is important to us. The political will is here. I think the political will needs to be there from every level speaking the same language. I would ask that that is throughout the entire project of all three projects or however many projects there are. That that is kept at the table the entire time.

We have found that women seeking women drives this conversation. That they are the most underrepresented demographic in the industry. So, when you focus on the most difficult piece, the other pieces start to come up with them. Drive that women number, let everybody know.

I had the very fortunate opportunity to go to college because of the wages that my family or I when I started working. And after that I opened a nonprofit to help kids in Dorchester, Roxbury, Mattapan, South Boston, Hyde Park get into high school and college through sports, academics, nutrition, wellness, just providing resources to folks that may or may not have it.

But what I saw was there has to be a level of changing the conversation. That if we continue to say you can't get into these trades, someone is going hear that and believe it.

I think the message has to be if you want be part of it, go take advantage of it.

So, from your level -- From our level we're

2.1

doing that. We're saying that if you want this come get it. I think that conversation is to change. I want everybody that speaks on this type -- on our industry or on this message, they should be speaking from the same script.

The ethos of what's happening in this industry has to change. It has already thawed. The time to get in has changed. That was years ago. The time to do better is now as we move forward. So, I think all of those different pieces should remain in the conversation that we are jointly having as an entire stakeholder group. So, I'd just like to make those points too.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: One just quick final point, if I can. The license conditions that we've given our two license designees for the Category 1's require them once they select a general contractor, to come in and meet with us personally to talk about what those diversity goals obviously and how important those are.

So, Mark, to your point we're starting off the conversation as early as we

possibly can. The interesting kind of new
nuance out of the gaming legislation was
veterans. You probably have a lot of veterans
in your workforce who may or may not selfidentify themselves as having been in the armed
services.

Any thoughts or any ideas as to what the population of your membership is, just kind of a ballpark to see how many have military experience prior to getting into the construction trades? It's a number we really haven't talked about. So, I'm just curious as to any thoughts you had on that.

MR. ERLICH: I would be hesitant to estimate numbers with any kind of reliability. We have had a partnership with a program called Helmets to Hardhats for many years, which has been returning veterans.

There is a very simple crossover from serving in the military to us serving on a construction site. There's a high level of discipline required. You've got to be there on time. Once you're there, there is no fooling around. You work under unpleasant conditions

1 out in the open.

So, there's actually a kind of synergy between people who have succeeded in the military and people who have succeeded in construction. So, the numbers are high. I don't know what they are.

What's interesting now is as the military has become significantly more diverse that the Helmets to Hardhats program has actually been one of the programs that has helped add to the diversity of the construction workforce. Many of the most successful women who have come into the trades have military background.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Interesting.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Brian, do you know how many positions are there in all of your apprenticeship programs in any given year roughly?

MR. DOHERTY: That's a good question. I would speak to the trend if I can. And it's very tied very much to the economic cycle. We are a boom/bust industry. As we ramp up, just simply put ballpark number, it'd

be tough to say, but I do know that we have had internal meetings both in DC, here at the state level and then at the Council level. And we are trying to track the markets a bit.

We have doubled and tripled our apprenticeship programs in the past two years. We're expecting to triple them next year. So, the time is now for an opportunity. I think with all of the cranes in the city of Boston and the outlying immediate areas, plus the additional three major projects through this gaming legislation, we are preparing for the larger opportunities to come in. As a ballpark number I don't have that for you off the top of my head.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you know 500, 1000, 10,000?

MR. ERLICH: I think maybe I could project. I cover all of the New England. Our apprentice training facility is in Millbury, Massachusetts, Central Massachusetts. I'd like to say it's equally and convenient for everybody. We were at 250 apprentices in 2011. That's for Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maine,

1 New Hampshire, Vermont. Connecticut we're 2 about to merge that in. We're now at 1100. We 3 quadrupled it in four years. And the diversity 4 -- You walk in there and it feels extremely 5 diverse. So, we probably represent about a 6 third of the jobs on one of these. So, I think 7 you could kind of extrapolate. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How many members 9 are in your collective group, total members? 10 What's the membership of your Council? 11 MR. DOHERTY: So, we represent 20 12 trades. And those trades are just about 13 anybody you can think of in roads and bridges 14 infrastructure and commercial high-rises, 15 infrastructure work or any type of vertical 16 building. In this area, those 20 trades have 17 35,000 members. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 35,000? 19 MR. DOHERTY: But again, it will get 20 tricky as a regional impact. Some of the 21 trades that I represent are New England trades. Some of them are tri-state trades. 22 In this 23 area there are thousands. I wouldn't venture a

guess much more than 14,000 maybe. I'm talking

- 1 | specifically again to the Boston region. So
- 2 to the statewide number I think it's 75,000,
- 3 but that's family members. So, I'm basing this
- 4 on our healthcare coverage.
- 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is Susan
- 6 | volunteering to speak?
- 7 MS. MOIR: 3,757 is the answer to
- 8 | your question.
- 9 CHAIRMAN CRSOBY: Which question?
- 10 MS. MOIR: The apprentices in
- 11 | Massachusetts.
- 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: In Massachusetts
- 13 | three thousand six hundred and some?
- 14 MS. MOIR: 3757 as of the last
- 15 | quarterly report. That's a 20 percent increase
- 16 | since last year.
- 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And that's in
- 18 | Massachusetts in the construction trades.
- 19 MS. MOIR: Across the state.
- 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. You ought
- 21 to get a little guidance from Susan on your
- 22 data.
- MR. DOHERTY: She's a great
- 24 teammate. We can always rely on Susan. Thank

1 you, Susan. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is really 3 And we appreciate this has got to come 4 from every direction. And having it come from 5 the heads of the unions, as you well understand 6 is really critical. So, we really appreciate this. 8 MR. DOHERTY: I would just like to 9 simply put it once more, the capital of the political will is different than it used to be. 10 11 And moving forward, it is going to reflect 12 economic and social opportunities for 13 everybody. So, now's the time to get in. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great, thank you. 15 Is that it for you Jill? 16 MS. GRIFFIN: Yes. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right, thank 18 General Counsel Blue? 19 MS. BLUE: Good afternoon, 20 Commissioners. You have in your packet today a 21 set of regulations for the Race Horse 22 Development Fund. 23 And I think just to give you sort of

a broad overview. There's actually two

regulations in that packet. The reason for it is that the Race Horse Development Fund is found in 23K. So, those regulations may end up in the section of regulations that pertain to 23K.

The second group of regulations, which gives the Commission some flexibility on Race Horse licensing will probably end up under the 128A regulation. So, we've separated them. But they do work together and they do have some interaction.

So, to go over the high points, the Race Horse Development Fund regulations as we discussed last time are put forward to give some clarity as to how that money will be used and how it will be paid out. This is a very new fund under the Commission's statute. So, this is a good time to take a look at how we're going to deal with that.

It does a few things. It requires someone who holds a racing license to notify the Commission if it's going to take any kind of action. Action being something like shutting down, transferring a license, going

dark. And they have to give the Commission 30 days prior notice.

Once they give that to the

Commission, these regs. give the Commission the

authority to hold a hearing and determine

what's best to do given the situation that's in

front of the Commission.

The regs. go out to talk about how the Race Horse Development Fund is paid out.

It tracks the statute. But there are some places where the statute isn't quite as clear. So, we've tried to clarify that in the regs.

It describes how the funds will be distributed by a licensee once a licensee gets them. And that's also set by statute. It gives the Commission the authority to hold certain funds in escrow. Especially in a situation where there is a track that goes dark or a license that is being transferred or something else that's occurring that the Commission feels in the best interest of the industry it would make sense to hold the funds in escrow.

It does make payment of the Race

Horse Development funds contingent upon the licensee accepting and adhering to safety standards as they're adopted by the Commission.

And the idea is that this pot of money under the Race Horse Development Fund is a little different than the purse money that came out under 128A.

So, in this situation we thought it would be a good idea for the Commission to at least suggest that before you can receive payment as a licensee, you adhere to whatever broad safety standards the Commission has adopted for racing.

The funds can be escrowed by the Commission for up to three years. What we've also done is given the Horse Racing Committee the ability and the authority to determine the split of Race Horse Development funds if there is more than one licensee in a particular area. So, for example, if there were three harness racing licensees, we would go back to the Race Horse Committee and ask them to determine how that money should be split between multiple licensees.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Could they rethink the overall split or is that locked in stone and you could only take say the harness racing 25 percent and split it three ways?

MS. BLUE: Essentially, it's both.

The Race Horse Committee does have the right to rethink the split. And they have talked about looking at that annually. This would be sort of a subset of that once they determine the split.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

MS. BLUE: Under the second set of regs. that deal with the application, these regulations give them Commission the ability to waive deadlines for the filing or for acting on an application under certain circumstances.

So if, for example, there were no licensee in the Commonwealth and someone came forward outside of the timeframes, if an existing licensee has submitted notice to the Commission that it's not going to request a renewal of its license, it gives the Commission some flexibility on taking applications and making decisions.

1 These regs. also allow the 2 Commission to take supplemental information up 3 to 45 days before the beginning of a meet. 4 That 45-day number is arbitrary. And I think 5 we want to give some thought to that because it 6 depends on when the meet starts, obviously. But it would also depend perhaps on the 8 situation in front of the Commission and whether you had certain investigations to do or 9 10 certain things you wanted to look at and 11 whether 45 days before the start of a meet was 12 enough time in which to do that. So, that I 13 would appreciate direction from the Commission. 14 And then finally the regs. give the 15 Commission the ability to hold application 16 checks in escrow and to require that a bond, 17 which is required by statute, be submitted 30 18 days after award instead of with the 19 application. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. 21 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: The one piece 22 I, and you just brought it up, I don't think 45 23 days is enough time in order to complete an 24 investigation on the application. And hiring

alone is a process that takes some time. So, I think we should rethink that 45 days and I do think we need more time. I'm thinking maybe 90 days would be appropriate.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else have thoughts about that?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes. It was a question that kind of came up as we have gone through the hearing process this week in terms of we know the application process is somewhat fluid. We know some of these applications are kind of placeholder applications.

I also thought 45 days might be a little bit too close. Also think that there's got to be some communication back and forth kind of in an ongoing nature between our agency and whoever the applicants are to let them know what the deficiencies are to the extent that we can so that we don't bump up against some of these timeframes.

Yes, I would like to see it extended out. Ninety days certainly sounds doable.

We'll get some feedback on that obviously when these go out.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: A lot of the funds are paid -- I haven't looked at this in detail but one of the first reactions I had that the funds would be paid to the horse racing associations, provided that they are associated with a racing licensee? Or how is that nexus to the racing licensee?

MS. BLUE: The language in section 60 of 23K is a little bit vague. So, what we did in the regulations was set it up so that the 80 percent, which is the purse money, would go to a racing association.

The 16 percent and then the four percent could come directly from the Commission to the breeders program because the statute says it can go to a breeders program approved by the Commission. The four percent that I always refer to as health and welfare benefits can go into an account set up for health and welfare benefits.

So, we tried to give the Commission the flexibility to make the smaller of three payments go directly to a place that's not

associated with a licensee, but that the bigger
amount would go to the license racing
association.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Which would be the racing licensee?

MS. BLUE: Yes, it would be.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay

MS. BLUE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We discussed the issue of if in fact the licensee happens to be, for example, the horsemen. So decisions on using that money -- that complicates the decisions on how to use that money.

MS. BLUE: So, for the benefit of I think the folks that are listening to us or watching us, what has happened the past with the money that goes into purses now is that money is a piece of the wagers. And that money stays with the licensee. And the licensee takes that money, comingles it with other funds and then enters into a purse agreement with the horseman's groups.

In that situation by contract, the license and the horseman's group can determine

what they're going to do with that purse money.

In this situation where the money is coming from gaming license fees and then in the future from ongoing gaming revenues, the Commission would want to consider what would happen when that money went to a licensee if the licensee were the same entity as the group that was entering into the purse agreement.

It strikes me initially as it would be sort of like someone doing a contract with themselves. So, the Commission might want to consider what additional either conditions they would put on the license, if that were the situation or perhaps -- I'm sure we'll get comments on the regs. But perhaps if we need to add more to the regs. to address that particular situation.

But it is something to think about because that's not commonly what happens now.

COMMISSIONE CAMERON: I'm thinking a condition on a license would be appropriate and maybe a plan that would have to be approved.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else?

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, we probably

should have just a brief discussion about
emergency regulations, whether or not there is
a case I think for these to be move forward as
an emergency.

I'm guessing after we did the public
comment, we could probably accomplish that by
the November 20 meeting. Of course we have the

distributions would take place in November.

distributions -- We're assuming the

Then the second set that Catherine's been talking about -- the second set of regulations govern the application we have now. So, that's kind of why we need them in effect before we can go with the process. The process in this case is about 160 days I think.

MS. BLUE: It's longer. This has the additional time before the Legislature that our 23K regs. do not.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do we need to act on that?

MR. DAY: I just wanted to run it by the Commission here just briefly kind of the thought process as we prepared to bring them back to the Commission that's how we'd prepare

1 them.

2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does that make 3 sense to you?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

MS. BLUE: So, we'll put them out for informal comment now, bring them back on the 20th. We can certainly do that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Next one?

MS. BLUE: The next item that you have in your package, you have three amended small business impact statements. These are for the capital investment regs., for the surveillance regs. and for the regulatory monitoring and inspections.

These are all regulations that have gone through the public hearing process. This is just the final step to file them.

You also have in your package comments from Penn and MGM on the surveillance regs. We did consider their very thoughtful comments very carefully. We think we've addressed them to a broad degree in the regulations themselves. So, we didn't make any additional changes. But we did appreciate the

comments and we did go back and review them as against what we had.

So, if the Commission would vote to approve the amended small business impact statements and the regulations as they stand, we will file them. And then they will go through the process and become final.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is just on the SBIS?

MS. BLUE: It's on the amended SBIS yes and the regulations we have attached.

12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, you're looking
13 for final approval of these regs.?

MS. BLUE: Yes, so we can move them forward. Mr. Grossman advises me, we did make some changes to the surveillance regs. based upon comments we received but they are in here and they've gone through the public hearing process.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Did we make some change in response to the comment that I think we got both from -- we got more than one about taking over the surveillance room and excluding people from it?

```
1
                MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon,
            I'm not sure if this draft made it into
 2
     aqain.
 3
     the packet. We have taken a look at all of the
 4
     comments and made some recommendations in red
5
     in the draft incorporating some of the
6
     comments. If you compare the comments received
     from Penn National and from MGM, you will see
 7
8
     that they were in agreement in a number of
9
     areas.
10
                And in response, we wanted to
11
     address some of those areas in here. And to
12
     get to that one in particular --
13
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Could I just
14
     stop you there because my draft doesn't have
15
     any red.
16
                MR. GROSSMAN: Page 160 in the
17
     Commissioners' packet.
18
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
                                       What page?
                MR. GROSSMAN: Page 160 in the
19
20
     Commissioners' packet. It's page two of our
21
     actual draft.
22
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You're talking CMR
23
     141?
24
                MR. GROSSMAN:
                               Yes.
```

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Mine has red. 2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, I see 3 there are concerns about the security have been 4 addressed but not - I don't see the piece about the surveillance room. 5 6 MR. BAND: 141.02(a)2. 7 MR. GROSSMAN: Top of page two 8 paragraph two. 9 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Only in an 10 extreme situation is how you address that. There are no alternatives. 11 12 MR. BAND: No alternative means to 13 do that. We felt that whatever investigations 14 they might be doing might be compromised if we 15 didn't take that action. 16 In some other jurisdictions, I don't 17 think it's ever been used but you don't want to 18 take the possibility out totally that a 19 circumstance might arise that you might need to 20 do that. 21 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: What kind of a 22 circumstance might arise when you need to do 23 that? I thought the comments made sense. 24 MR. BAND: I would say that if you

1 felt somebody in the room was involved in this in some form or fashion and would compromise 2 3 what you're trying to do or tip off somebody as 4 to what you're trying to do, it just gives you the option to do it to forward an 5 6 investigation. I would be surprised if it was ever used but you don't want to take out that 8 possibility all together. 9 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That was the 10 only circumstance I could think of it, was 11 someone in that room as part of an 12 investigation. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Couldn't that 14 be part of the regulation? 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No, then 16 they'd know if you did it that's what you were doing. 17 That's not going to help an 18 investigation if the person knows that you're 19 looking at them. 20 I hear what COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 21 you're saying. But it seemed to me that 22 they've got a great deal of responsibility that 23 they're implementing through this surveillance 24 system. And I thought -- except in an

extraordinary circumstance, which it seems to me we ought to be able to define, excluding them from this area impedes their ability to control the safety of the premises that they're responsible for.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think all they are saying is that's true. And it probably would never happen, but there might be theoretically a situation where it could be called for.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And security is a joint operation. The troopers that would be in there would certainly --

any trouble with the troopers, but it's who is ultimately responsible for it. Suppose we exclude people there and something goes wrong and somebody gets hurt, is the Commission then responsible for something that could have been prevented had the people been there who knew what they were looking for.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Troopers that work in gaming are very familiar with surveillance rooms and are very capable of

- 1 monitoring those cameras during an
  2 investigation.
- COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. I
- 4 hear you.

8

- COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I had the
  same concern other than when we explain it, no
  alternative means and that is really rare. I'm
- 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are you all right?
  10 Any others?

comfortable with that additional language.

- 11 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I just had a
  12 quick question on page six, the requirement of
  13 how long you need to keep a recording.
- MR. BAND: Thirty days.
- 15 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes. We
  16 start to deviate and say the licensee can ask
  17 us for permission. Why don't we just leave it
  18 at 30, cut and dry?
- MR. BAND: It became I think more of a storage issue. There would be certain filming because they're kind of required to film everything they do. And let's say of an escalator or something like that they might only want to keep for seven days.

I don't really see that as being a huge issue if that's what they would want to keep as a retention period for that. I would say gaming operations and things that are happening more in the cage you'd certainly want to keep for 30 days.

Thirty is probably the highest limit in the country. The original most people use seven, but that was originally designed because video tape was being used and the number of tapes that you would have to have to make then retain more was ridiculous. But 30 I think is certainly a reasonable length of time that you certainly would catch any possible problem in investigating you wouldn't have.

I believe that the Attorney

General's office actually asked us to make it

60.

about the piece where the licensee can petition. So, are they going to come back to us and say can we throw away the escalator tapes?

MR. BAND: It would be on a one-by-

1 one basis. And you can't just blanket say what 2 you have to or what's not, because every 3 property is designed differently. So, one 4 entrance to an escalator might lead to a money 5 area, you might want to make them keep. 6 you'd have to really handle that one by one which would be part of the surveillance 8 submission that they would review with you. Just based on the 9 MR. GROSSMAN: 10 comments, my expectation would be not so much 11 that they'd come after and say can I throw this 12 stuff away, but that they would come before and 13 say here are the 50 areas that we're recording, 14 for these 20 is it okay if we just keep them 15 for seven days instead of 30 in advance. 16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: So, you look 17 at it kind of as a one-time request? 18 MR. BAND: Yes, it would be when 19 you're doing your surveillance submission. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: On page three of 21 the printed regs. there's the thing that 22 requires dedicated facial recognition coverage. 23 Apparently that's available, that's a 24 requirement that can be met?

MR. BAND: We had found in New 1 2 Jersey, and that's what I'll use as an example, 3 we had two holdups at the cashier's cage. 4 there weren't necessarily designated cameras 5 right on the face of the patron that was 6 committing the robbery. We found it invaluable for events that happened later during the 8 course of things because we had a clear concise photo of that individual. We could run it 9 10 through facial recognition. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I misunderstood. 11 12 You're not saying facial recognition software. 13 You're just saying a camera on their face. 14 Sorry, got it. 15 We say that because the MR. BAND: quality camera makes a difference as to whether 16 17 you're able to utilize that picture or not. 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: The higher 19 quality. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I was in the 21 Matrix I was -- Others? 22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I just had a 23 question on page four. How did we decide -- I 24 know the comments were for B(1), we had 35,000

we went to 50. They asked for 100 or more?

That was a compromise?

MR. BAND: It's somewhat of an arbitrary number anyway. 35,000 was something that was from the past. I figured with inflation 50 would be there. But there aren't an abundance of machines that offer a jackpot of 50,000 or above. We thought it was a fair number.

asked for cameras, obviously, it's important to have them in the parking areas. But during our visits to establishments, we notice there are cameras that zoom in on license plates coming in and out of the garage. Is that something obviously a benefit to the licensee and to us to actually require that kind of license plate camera?

MR. BAND: The license plate is actually software that let's say you do have a robbery or something like that you can identify everybody that came in and out of the garage, get an address, name from registration. It's been useful. I know a few of the properties I

1 worked at have that. And it's actually helped 2 them solve quite a few crimes by doing that. 3 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Should we be 4 specific though in terms of that actual license 5 plate camera as opposed to just general parking 6 areas of the gaming establishment? MR. BAND: Maybe I could get Karen's 8 assistance a little bit on this. 9 MS. WELLS: I think that we would 10 need to look at the facility. MGM's facility, 11 we were just out there last week, they're 12 proposed facility is very different. 13 Plainridge is a one entrance, one exit. So, I 14 think we'd work with the licensee on what makes 15 sense, sort of balancing public safety and the 16 interest of the casino against civil liberties 17 of people that are going in and out. I think 18 you have to be cognizant of both sides. 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I didn't cross walk all of their comments back to the text. 20 21 So, the remote access that Blue Tarp was 22 concerned about --23 MR. BAND: Both Plainridge and MGM.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Did you address

that?

MR. GROSSMAN: It's on page two, that's paragraph four. And I think Director Wells will address that.

MS. WELLS: I think that one of their comments was regarding the security and concerns about an additional line. That's the reason that the language was modified to say that the transmissions have been encrypted to ensure security. So, that's to address the concern.

From my perspective I feel strongly that we do want the remote access for law enforcement and for regulatory enforcement purposes. It does make a difference that we have the ability to look at what we're looking at without people in the room knowing that we're looking at it. That's an advantage that I think is worthwhile.

Also, we have based on the set up we have in Massachusetts, we're not in Atlantic City where our offices are right near all of the casinos. The casinos are in different locations. So, there's a benefit to the

1 Commission if we're working on different 2 investigations having a remote location. 3 personally think that it's worthwhile. 4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And in the 5 places I've seen, the Commission room in the 6 casino is a room separate from the surveillance 7 And that room on premises has access. 8 MS. WELLS: Yes, right. 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Why wouldn't 10 that serve the purpose? 11 MS. WELLS: Because there would be 12 people such as myself or the commanding officer 13 from the State Police and other people who may 14 be working on investigations that may not be in 15 Springfield or Everett or in Plainville. 16 would be the advantage. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is that used in 18 some places? 19 MR. BAND: Not to my knowledge. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This would be 21 unique to us. 22 MR. BAND: Yes. 23 I don't know COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 24 that it's unique.

1 MR. BAND: I say I don't know of 2 anyplace else. I have though been in 3 conferences we're we've seen live feed of other 4 people's casino floor. It wasn't like to the 5 regulators or anything like that, but I have 6 seen it. Back further on encryption wasn't up 8 to what it used to be today. I think it's less 9 of an issue now. Military uses encrypted 10 video. Everybody else can do encrypted at a 11 level that you don't have to worry about 12 somebody stealing a signal. 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It's very 14 common in policing now also to have the off-15 site availability. I would agree. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there a cost 17 implication to this. 18 MR. BAND: It's usually just done 19 over like a T-1 line. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We would do it on 21 our own line. It doesn't cost the operator 22 anything. 23 MR. BAND: That's right. 24 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Don't we have

to have a secure facility in our place where you look at this? When you go into these surveillance rooms, you have to sign in a book and somebody stands by the book 24 hours a day.

MS. WELLS: In the new office space, it would be in the IEB section which will be locked and have restricted access.

MR. BAND: The sign-in log would serve more of a purpose as to who they are allowing in there.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I know. It serves as an accountability piece. I know we're not going to be sloppy about this. But the accountability piece --

Shot at this nearly dead horse and that's paragraph two. I finally have found my red. What about leaving that as it is but saying something along the lines of no exclusion can occur without the personal authorization of the head of the IEB or the division. So, you've got to get individual, identified individual at the very top to sign off on this before it can happen.

```
1
                MS. WELLS: I would say either
 2
     myself as the director --
 3
                MR. BAND: Something that would be
 4
     involved in anyway hopefully.
5
                MS. WELLS: I would say the director
6
     or the commanding officer of the Gaming
 7
     Enforcement Unit of the State Police.
8
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I thought it
    was the AG's division of gaming enforcement
9
10
     that we were talking about.
11
                MS. WELLS: Oh, the division.
                                                I'm
12
     sorry. So, that would be the division
13
     director.
14
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Director of
15
     the division or the director of the IEB.
16
                MS. WELLS: It does say the
17
     Commission and the division. So, I would think
18
     the Commission would be IEB and the division --
19
     I would just say if I was not available I would
20
     also defer to in the present example would be
21
    Detective Lieutenant Connors if I was not
22
     available to direct that. The division would
23
    be the division's Assistant Attorney General
24
     Chief, so that presently Patrick Hanley.
```

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's fine 2 with me so long as there is an identifiable 3 individual who has to sign off on this before 4 it happens. 5 MS. WELLS: I would be in agreement 6 with that. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. Now the 8 horse is dead. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else? 10 Where are we now? 11 MR. GROSSMAN: If the Commission is 12 comfortable with these changes as amended, this 13 document has now been through the entire 14 promulgation process. It's ready for final 15 promulgation if you're ready to do it now or 16 whenever it seems appropriate. 17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I would move 18 that we approve the surveillance of the gaming 19 establishment regulations with the amended 20 change just identified. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And the SBIS, the 22 amended SBIS. 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And the 24 amended -- I don't think that was amended

1 though. 2 MR. GROSSMAN: It's called the 3 amended SBIS. 4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Oh, it's called the amended SBIS. Yes and the amended 5 6 SBIS. 7 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Did that cover 9 everything? No. We would also ask 10 MS. BLUE: 11 that you approve the capital investment 12 regulations and the amended SBIS for that to go 13 forward and the amended SBIS and the regulatory 14 monitoring and inspection reg. as well. 15 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Do you want 16 an individual motion? 17 MS. BLUE: If you want to do all 18 three at one time, that would be great. But we 19 can do them individually too that's fine. But 20 there's three separate regulations we would 21 like to move forward. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And two or three 23 SBIS's.

MS. BLUE: Three SBIS's and three

1 regulations. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you want to 3 take that one from the top? 4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, we 5 weren't going to discuss those, correct? We've 6 already discussed those enough? MS. BLUE: The other ones we should 8 It's my understanding we did not make 9 changes to the monitoring reg. and the capital 10 investment we haven't made changes to. 11 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. Let me 12 get them all. So, I move that we --13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's 7(b) on the 14 agenda, 7(b) might help. 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I have 7(b) 16 I have to flip the pages to get all of 17 the titles correct. So, the first amended 18 small business impact statement is 205 CMR 141 19 surveillance of the gaming establishment, and 20 that to include the surveillance of the gaming 21 establishment regulations with the changes just identified. Then the amended SBIS and final 22 23 version of the capital investment as well as

the administrative search and seizure

Page 271 1 regulations. 2 MS. BLUE: Yes, and the amended SBIS 3 for that. 4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And the SBIS 5 that accompanies that. 6 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I'll re-7 second that motion. 8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 9 That's what Steve was trying to tell me to do. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We have a second. 11 Do we have any other discussion? Okay. All in 12 favor, aye. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 14 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 18 have it unanimously. Thank you very much. 19 don't we take a quick break and then we'll 20 finish up with item number eight. 21 22 (A recess was taken) 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We will reconvene 24

- 1 meeting number 137 at about 3:30. Director
  2 Wells of the IEB all by herself.
- MS. WELLS: I am all by myself, but
- 4 | not for long. Good afternoon, on the agenda
- 5 this afternoon are the results of the
- 6 suitability investigation for an additional
- 7 | Wynn MA, LLC qualifier, Mr. Robert DeSalvio.
- 8 And Mr. DeSalvio is present here this
- 9 afternoon.
- 10 Mr. DeSalvio was hired by Wynn
- 11 Resorts Limited in March of 2014 as Senior Vice
- 12 | President of Development for Wynn Resorts
- 13 development. He will be overseeing the
- 14 | Massachusetts facility in Everett. He was just
- 15 recently officially named President of Wynn MA,
- 16 LLC.
- 17 Mr. DeSalvio submitted all of the
- 18 required forms and supplemental document
- 19 requests to the IEB. And our investigators
- 20 conducted a rigorous background check. The
- 21 full report has been given to you for your
- 22 consideration.
- As I've said on numerous occasions
- 24 doing these qualifier reports before, the areas

1 covered in the investigation included 2 employment history, criminal record, education, 3 directorships and shareholder interests, civil 4 litigation, bankruptcies, property ownership, political contributions, references and media 5 6 coverage. Investigators also conducted a financial responsibility evaluation with 8 positive results. Mr. DeSalvio obtained a bachelor of 9 10 science in business administration from the 11 University of Denver in 1978. He began his 12 career in the casino industry in 1979 as a 13 sales manager for Caesar's in Atlantic City, 14 New Jersey. From 1981 to '83, he was the 15 National Sales Manager for Bally in Atlantic

at Sands in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

From 1997 to 2006 he was the

Executive Vice President of Marketing Vice

President of Marketing at Foxwoods Resorts in

Connecticut. And from 2006 to 2014 he was the

President of Sands Casino Resort in Las Vegas,

City, New Jersey. From 1983 to 1987 he was the

Executive Vice President of Marketing and then

Director Casino Marketing Credit Executive Host

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Sands in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania before taking a position with Wynn.

During his career, Mr. DeSalvio has been licensed in four other jurisdictions New Jersey, Connecticut, Nevada and Pennsylvania.

The report does note a matter from Connecticut where in 1999 Mr. DeSalvio authorized two cash vouchers allegedly in contravention of governing standards of the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation. Foxwoods settled that matter with the Connecticut Department of Special Revenue in February 2001 and acknowledged that the governing standards and controls were not entirely clear.

Foxwoods has since revised and clarified the policies and procedures. There was no individual discipline against Mr.

DeSalvio. He remained licensed and in good standing in Connecticut and was subsequently licensed in Pennsylvania after leaving Foxwoods and taking a position with Sands in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

Overall, Mr. DeSalvio has demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence

```
that he is suitable for licensure in
1
     Massachusetts. And therefore the IEB is
 2
 3
     recommending that the Commission find him
 4
     suitable. No conditions are recommended.
5
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Questions?
6
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I see no
7
     reason why we shouldn't approve this. For a
8
     career this long, I am actually surprised there
9
     is only one minor issue here of note. It's a
10
     clean investigation.
11
                MS. WELLS: We are comfortable.
12
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do we have a
    motion?
13
14
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
                                        I move that
15
    we approve this applicant as a qualifier, Mr.
    DeSalvio.
16
17
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
18
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:
                                      Second.
19
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any further
20
    discussion? All in favor, aye.
21
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:
                                      Aye.
22
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
                                       Aye.
23
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
                                      Aye.
24
                COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
                                        Aye.
```

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously. Congratulations. Now you have some more topics.

MS. WELLS: Okay. I've got my team here now. I believe next on the agenda is the internal controls which I believe there was some discussion earlier when I was in the back of the room in conjunction with the credit. I defer to Mr. Grossman and Mr. Band on some of the substantive matters. My understanding is we need to make a decision on what we want to do moving this forward.

MR. GROSSMAN: This document is a work in progress as you can probably tell from looking at it. There are a number of citations and the like that need to be tightened up. We certainly look forward to comments from the licensees and designated licensees on this.

We received a comment this morning from MGM relative to an overall approach that they would like the Commission to consider as we move forward this particular document. I don't think we have a lot of substantive comment to make relative to this.

At the moment, I think it would be most helpful for us to develop a plan for moving this forward at this point.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there anything that you would, not to necessarily discuss now, but just for purposes of our own thinking about this, is there anything you would particularly point our attention to?

MR. GROSSMAN: I think what MGM's comments are and these are overall an area that we have been and will continue to look at is the level of prescriptiveness that we have included in some of the areas and whether that is the best approach.

Whether it's essential for us to do that or to make it more risk-based and say to the licensees you must submit a policy and protocol relative to whatever it is. As opposed to us saying you have to submit the policy and it has to contain the following 15 elements or what have you.

And that's something that we'll continue to look at. There's no one area that I think needs to be pointed out today. But

1 | that's the overall theme of this whole process.

I think we've done a good job of identifying the areas in need of policies and in need of attention. The question then becomes how do you go about ensuring that the internal control that's submitted to us is of the quality that we would be looking for. That is the process we are looking at right now.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If you took the less prescriptive route.

MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, exactly, what level of prescription is essential.

MS. WELLS: I was just going to say what also might be helpful in balances is with the licensees having some direction for them so they are not creating documents which we are then coming back to them and saying no, this isn't good enough. You need to do something better. That they have some idea of what the framework should be so that there is not a continual back-and-forth with the internal controls. And they know what we really would expect and what would make us comfortable on our end for the Commission and that would be

1 sufficient.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But the fundamental process here is that they submit a document of internal controls, gets reviewed here and needs to include certain minimum standards. And they're all articulated here. The level of that prescriptiveness is a matter of debate or ongoing analysis.

But when after they submit that it could be turned around with comments, requests for improvements or etc., etc. The general framework here is it allows for that process. Submit, review and resubmit if needed, which I believe is a reasonable good approach.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I haven't read this letter. It's dated today. It's long.

But we've always had these continuing dialogue between how much detail to put in there and how much to leave to the licensee.

What the chips have to look like, that's like money regulations. That needs to be highly detailed. The other end, there's something that doesn't need to be detailed at all and they could probably give us anything

1 that would work. And then there's everything else that's in the middle. 2 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Where does this 4 fall on the continuum now, Bruce? What does 5 this represent on the continuum of best 6 practice? MR. BAND: Right now, I think you 8 are probably standard in most jurisdictions, of 9 course not in Nevada which is a completely a 10 different operation. I think it would be 11 greatly beneficial to us to be able to see the 12 property's comments and specifics about that 13 and give that full consideration. We're always 14 willing to take a look at another point of 15 view. 16 The one comment we did get was this 17 morning. And nobody's really had time to 18 review that in detail. So, I would kind of 19 take that approach to get the responses back 20 from the industry. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Where are 22 we in the process for this? How much longer for this --23 24 MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman I think in

1 order to phase 2 -- The testimony from Mr. 2 George this morning, in order be able to 3 support Penn's efforts, we need to try to get 4 this finished by the end of January, which 5 we've got about a 60-day formal process. So, 6 we'd have to try to move our internal controls into the formal process by about November 20. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. This will 9 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 10

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: This will come back to us in a couple weeks with comments and whatever proposed changes based on those comments.

MR. DAY: Yes. And we're hoping as well that we'd be able to combine -- it's possible to be able to combine. Commissioner Enrique and his group as well are working on two other sets to go with this set. So, the best world would be to be able to get those all ready to go on the 20th.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: These are out now for obviously -- These internal control regulations are now out for the informal public comment before the formal public comment period.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

```
1
                MR. DAY: That's correct.
 2
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The informal
3
    process runs how much longer?
 4
                MR. DAY: It usually runs about 10
5
     days in total. But I think these have been out
6
    now, this section has been out for that period,
 7
    haven't they?
8
                MR. GROSSMAN: It's been out for a
9
    number of weeks.
                MR. DAY: We could move them
10
11
     forward, I suppose. But I think in this
12
     situation because there are things that have
13
     come in for the licensees, it's better for us
14
     to hold --
15
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We agree with
16
     that. Okay, next, next up.
17
                MS. WELLS: So, we don't need to do
18
     anything?
19
                MR. GROSSMAN: Just to clarify, I
20
     guess we will post the credit draft for
21
     informal public comment. Leave this out there
22
     for informal public comment and bring it back
23
    before you in two or four weeks.
24
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
```

MS. WELLS: I think the last thing on the IEB agenda was the gaming equipment regulations, Loretta.

MS. LILLIOS: Good afternoon. This regulation on gaming equipment as drafted focuses on equipment for table games. And you are seeing this for the first time. Its subsections are subdivided into chips and plaques, equipment and layouts for the table games themselves, dice, cards and tiles, and a section on Commission inspection and approval of gaming equipment.

The regulation covers the equipment and table layouts for about 30 of the most popular table games. And the games in this reg. will correspond with the games included in the regulation on rules of the games, which is being drafted now.

The chips and plaques section sets forth specifications for the manufacturer of the various chips, and builds in steps for Commission and IE approval in the design and manufacture process.

This is to ensure that the physical

characteristics of the chips, for example, the graphics, colors, edge designs of the various denominations have appropriate differential features, have built-in anti-counterfeit measures and are designed so that certain features can be viewed from the gaming establishment's closed circuit television system.

The chips and plaques section also includes provisions requiring the gaming establishment to inspect chips. It includes provision for the handling of chips, their storage, provisions for documenting, inventory and for the destruction of chips.

The game section sets out specification for the gaming equipment and table layouts associated with the approximately 30 games now included. And there is also a petition process if the gaming licensee wants to add a game not presently included.

The reg. as drafted also allows the establishment to offer alternative layouts for some games with notice to the IEB and to patrons. And the dice section and the cards

and tiles section like the chips section also specifies design features, handling and storage requirements and inventory measures.

Mr. Band has taken the laboring oar on the substance of this regulation. We'd be happy to try to answer any questions. It would be our suggestion to put these out for informal public comment at this time. Since it's a table game reg. and it applies to the Category 1 licensees, this seems to be sufficient time for that to happen. And this is the first time that you are seeing it.

We would intend to work the licensees to get their comments and also to identify an appropriate manufacturer or manufacturers to ask for their comments as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Questions?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I'd be interested from Mr. Band, I know that many of these are best practices and used pretty much uniformly from jurisdiction but there are some differences in jurisdictions.

MR. BAND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: How did we decide which way we wanted to go?

MR. BAND: I took what I thought was probably the most common used in the industry. Gaming equipment kind of like the rules of the game are pretty specific. Gaming equipment is you have some options with things like dice, whether you use rounded dice or what they call razor edge dice where you really want to use razor edge so people can't slide dice and it catches the felt and rolls, little specifics like that.

On the chips that's pretty much standard in the gaming industry from the manufacturers. You don't want somebody to be able to what they call barber poling chips from another casino or something in a pile. They should easy to identify that they are all XYZ casino's chips.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Same question I asked before. Besides the issue of prescriptiveness, is there anything in particular that you think we should be pay particular attention to?

I don't see this document 1 MR. BAND: 2 as being controversial in the industry. 3 pretty straightforward. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay, great. Anything else? 5 6 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I take it this 7 is one in which you think a lot of prescriptive 8 regulation ought to be --9 MR. BAND: You do spell it out 10 because the table layouts have winning odds on 11 it and particular spots for betting. It's 12 prescriptive because you don't want the spots 13 too close together where people would be able 14 to switch cards or cap bets and a lot of 15 things. 16 So, a lot of the things spelled out 17 in here are for games protection. And I think 18 you have to be when you're talking about 19 equipment because you're looking for some 20 specific standards. 21 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: This I take it 22 also is an area where you want standardization 23 across the jurisdiction? 24 MR. BAND: Yes.

```
1
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: For
2
     enforcement purposes.
 3
                MR. BAND: Yes.
 4
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else
5
     anybody? I think that may bring us to our
6
     conclusion. Anything else on anybody's agenda?
 7
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: What's the
8
     step here? We put these out for public
9
     comment?
                MS. LILLOS: For informal public
10
11
     comment, so no vote is needed.
12
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No vote for
13
     that, right. Okay, great.
14
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
15
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you.
16
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.
17
    Anything else, Catherine, John, Rick? Do I
18
    have a motion to adjourn.
19
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Move to
20
     adjourn.
21
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor, aye.
22
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:
                                      Aye.
23
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
24
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
```

```
Page 289
1
                 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
 2
                 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And we know what
 3
     that means.
 4
 5
                 (Meeting adjourned at 3:49 p.m.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

## ATTACHMENTS:

1

- Massachusetts Gaming Commission October
   23, 2014 Notice of Meeting and Agenda
- 4 2. Massachusetts Gaming Commission September 5 8-17, 2014 Meeting Minutes
- Massachusetts Gaming Commission September
   25, 2014 Meeting Minutes
- 8 4. Massachusetts Gaming Commission October 9,9 2014 Meeting Minutes
- 10 5. Penn National Gaming, Inc. Quarterly
  11 Report as of September 30, 2014
- 12 6. Wynn MA, LLC Monthly Update
- 7. Strategic Science Report on Informing Play
  Management Systems: International Review
  of Limit-Setting Tools
- 16 8. Massachusetts Gaming Commission October
  17 21, 2014 Memorandum Regarding Estimated
  18 Cost of Play Management Tools
- 9. 205 CMR 138.40 to 138.47 Uniform Standards
  of Accounting Procedures and Internal
  Controls DRAFT
- 22 10. 205 CMR XX.00 Race Horse Development Fund
  23 DRAFT

## 1 ATTACHMENTS:

- 2 | 11. Amended Small Business Impact Statement
- 3 205 CMR 122
- 4 | 12. 205 CMR 122 Capital Investment
- 5 13. Amended Small Business Impact Statement
- 6 205 CMR 141
- 7 14. 205 CMR 141 Surveillance of the Gaming
- 8 Establishment DRAFT with Attachments
- 9 15. Amended Small Business Impact Statement
- 10 205 CMR 142
- 11 | 16. 205 CMR 142 Regulatory Monitoring and
- 12 Inspections
- 13 | 17. Massachusetts Gaming Commission October
- 14 20, 2014 IEB Qualifier Report of Applicant
- 15 Wynn MA, LLC for Qualifier Robert DeSalvio
- 16 18. 205 CMR 138 Uniform Standards of
- 17 | Accounting Procedures and Internal
- 18 Controls DRAFT
- 19 | 19. 205 CMR 146 Gaming Equipment DRAFT

- 21 GUEST SPEAKERS:
- 22 David Cruise, Regional Employment Board Hampden
- 23 County
- 24 | Robert DeSalvio, Wynn MA, LLC

1 **GUEST SPEAKERS:** 2 Brian Doherty, Building and Trades Council 3 Mark Erlich, Carpenters Union 4 Lance George, Penn National Judith Glynn, Strategic Science 5 6 Michael Knapp, SkillSmart Laura Lee, MGM 8 Mike Mathis, MGM 9 Jennifer Pinck, Pinck and Company 10 Jack Rauen, Penn National 11 Stephen Rusteika, PMA Consultants 12 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION STAFF: 13 14 Bruce Band, Assistant Director IEB 15 Catherine Blue, General Counsel 16 Richard Day, Executive Director 17 Jill Griffin, Director Workforce, Supplier and 18 Diversity Development 19 Todd Grossman, Deputy General Counsel 20 Loretta Lillios, Deputy General Counsel 21 Mark Vander Linden, Dir. Research and Problem 22 Gambling 23 Karen Wells, Director IEB

Electronically signed by Laurie Jordan (201-084-588-3424)

24

John Ziemba, Ombudsman

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, Laurie J. Jordan, an Approved Court
4	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
5	is a true and accurate transcript from the
6	record of the proceedings.
7	
8	I, Laurie J. Jordan, further certify that the
9	foregoing is in compliance with the
LO	Administrative Office of the Trial Court
.1	Directive on Transcript Format.
L2	I, Laurie J. Jordan, further certify I neither
L3	am counsel for, related to, nor employed by any
L <b>4</b>	of the parties to the action in which this
-5	hearing was taken and further that I am not
-6	financially nor otherwise interested in the
L7	outcome of this action.
L8	Proceedings recorded by Verbatim means, and
L9	transcript produced from computer.
20	WITNESS MY HAND this 27th day of October,
21	2014.
22	Sauri Jordan (1)
23	LAURIE J. JORDAN My Commission expires:

Notary Public May 11, 2018