		Page 1
1	THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS	
2	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION	
3	PUBLIC MEETING #167	
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	October 29, 2015 10:30 a.m 2:37 p.m.	
20	HYNES CONVENTION CENTER	
21	900 Boylston Street, Room 312	
22	Boston, Massachusetts	
23		
24		

## 1 PROCEEDINGS:

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I am going to call
to order the 167 public meeting of the
Massachusetts Gaming Commission, 167, on
Cotober 29 at the Hynes Auditorium. The first
item on our agenda will be the approval of
minutes, Commissioner McHugh.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The minutes,
Mr. Chairman, are in the book, the minutes that
is of the meeting of October 15. And I would
their approval in the form they appear there
with the customary reservation of rights to
change, make mechanical changes and correct
typographical errors.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I second that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any discussion

about the minutes? All in favor?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All opposed? And

24 I did not vote as I was not at that meeting.

1 Next up, Ombudsman Ziemba.

MR. ZIEMBA: Good morning, Mr.

Chairman and Commissioners. First on the

agenda is the Region C request for application

two, RFA-2 evaluation process update.

On Tuesday within the deadline, we received a response from Mass Gaming and Entertainment, MG&E, regarding questions that we raised in the context of our administrative completeness review that is required under our regulations. On that same day, Tuesday, Licensing Director Paul Connelly issued a letter to MG&E stating that MG&E's RFA-2 application is complete.

Under the Commission's regulations, the notice begins the Commission's review of the RFA-2 application.

As for immediate next steps, we are working to get the new MG&E documents on our secure systems for review by the review teams. That could be done today or tomorrow. We are also working to get the additional non-confidential documents up on our website. The goal for that is by mid to late next week.

2.1

Following that, the next significant event is next Thursday, November 5. On that date MG&E will make its 90-minute presentation to the Commission. This 90-minute presentation is an opportunity for MG&E to present its application to the Commission.

As a reminder, this is not a public hearing involving public testimony like our host and surrounding community hearings.

However, as always, we welcome comments from anyone before or after the presentation mainly through our website, MGC Comments.

On February 12 (SIC) we will hear from surrounding community and impacted live entertainment petitioners and MG&E in the response to such petitions. We recently received MG&E's response to the petition.

There is both a written response to the petitions. They have been included in your packet. And then on the date of the presentation on February 12 (SIC) we have verbal presentations by both petitioners and a response by MG&E.

So, these meetings are the beginning

of a very thorough review by the Commission.

One further thing I will mention is that after numerous consultations with our review consultant, Pinck and Co., we have determined that staff will assume the majority of the coordination responsibilities for the Region C

This will enable us to ensure that our review is as resource efficient as possible while still being comprehensive and thorough. We still have the benefit of our team of specialty consultants, which will be utilized in our review.

At this time, I'd like to thank the Pinck and Co. team for all of their RFA-2 reviews that have been completed to date and for their continuing assistance as we move forward towards completion of these projects. Certainly, they would be available to assist us in any way possible and especially over the next few weeks they will help us in the transition.

Any questions on that?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything on this

review.

Page 6 1 item? 2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No, I think it 3 is very helpful. I just had a question on the 4 petitions. Do we know whether all the 5 petitioners, the universe of petitioners have 6 been submitted? MR. ZIEMBA: That is the universe of 8 petitioners. As you'll see from the responses, 9 there is potential that agreements could be 10 reached before the date of the hearing. 11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Before 12 February 12? 13 MR. ZIEMBA: No, before November 12. 14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Before their 15 presentation. 16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Before their 17 presentation. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Before their 19 presentation? 20 MR. ZIEMBA: Quite possible. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Before the MG&E 22 presentation? 23 MR. ZIEMBA: It's possible. It's 24 possible.

```
1
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: John, have we
2
    picked dates for the two public hearings?
3
                MR. ZIEMBA:
                                 We have a
                             No.
 4
     tentative schedule that is included in your
5
    packet, but we have not chosen all of the dates
 6
     for our hearings. But I think potentially it
     is still a little bit premature to do that
8
    because we first have to learn the entire
9
     universe of surrounding communities and
10
     impacted live entertainment venues.
11
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
                                  Right.
12
                MR. ZIEMBA: As we get a little bit
13
     further, we can maybe establish those dates.
14
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's fine,
15
     great. Anything else on this item?
16
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: John, this
17
     entire schedule assumes arbitration.
18
                MR. ZIEMBA: You are correct.
19
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That is just
20
    based on past experience but there is a
21
    possibility, correct -- that that would not
     occur and this whole schedule would be
22
23
     adjusted?
24
                MR. ZIEMBA: You are exactly right.
```

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.

MR. ZIEMBA: You are exactly right.

And in such instance, it could mean a decision could be made much earlier than the projected date here.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's a good point, Commissioner, thank you. Just to expand on that for anybody in the audience, the schedule anticipates the possibility that the host — that the applicant MG&E and one or more of the surrounding communities or the impacted live entertainment venues may not be able to come to an agreement, in which case there will be a mandated arbitration process which will extend things.

For the sake of being cautious, as Commissioner Cameron points out, we are assuming that there will have to be that arbitration process. If there isn't, if MG&E and all those parties, surrounding communities and entertainment venues, are able to come to agreements then we would all be very happy. And this process would be a couple of months quicker probably, a month or two quicker.

Thanks for that. Anything else? Okay, next up.

MR. ZIEMBA: Chairman and
Commissioners, Wynn Everett joins us today to
present their quarterly report and to then
present their latest site plan for the
Commission's review. No vote is scheduled by
the Commission today.

This site plan is the culmination of many months of efforts by the Wynn team following the Commission's request that Wynn review its design that was included in the conditions to Wynn's license.

Wynn followed that with a presentation to the Commission at the end of January of new renderings of the design of its proposed hotel. Throughout the rest of the year during quarterly reports and through conversations with Commission and Commission staff, Wynn provided updates on further changes and revisions.

We are also joined by our consulting team including Rick Mooreof City Point

Partners, Ray Profilio of Epstein Joslin

2.1

Architects, Jason Lawson from PMA and I believe Frank Tramontozzi. Frank Tramontozzi is here as well from Green International.

They have been reviewing Wynn's design and have provided comments to the Wynn team that the Wynn team will address in their presentation. Wynn will include some of those responses to those specific issues. And then Rick Moore and the team can provide further background regarding the issues that they raised to the Wynn team after Wynn's presentation.

I will note that the site plan review, the design review is affiliated but it is separate from the current Section 61 review that is before us and other agencies such as the Massachusetts Department of Transportation, MassDOT. That review including the review of Wynn's both immediate plans for Sullivan Square and long-term plans for Sullivan Square is ongoing.

After the presentation and responses from our consultant team, I would recommend that the Commission could discuss some further

2.1

steps. The Commission could take to get further public input on the design.

And specifically, staff including

General Counsel Blue, Director Driscoll and I

recommend that we place a request for comment

on our website for any comments related to the

design. And on a very central place on our

website, we could include all of the relevant

documents that we have been provided today.

And this would be a very good way for us to further get public comment from individuals and other parties, official parties that want to provide further comment regarding these designs. A similar section could be created for the MGM design, which we'll discuss in a few minutes. However, first things first.

I think Bob DeSalvio, Wynn Everett's president, and Chris Gordon from the Dirigo Group and any other members of the Wynn team, I think there might be one or two other members out there, to first present their quarterly report and then to give us the latest on their designs.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Could I, just

as we start, put this in the context at least that I understand it and to pick up on the theme, the public comment theme that you just mentioned a minute ago.

The Section 61 Findings that we're going to make under the certificate that the Secretary of Environmental Affairs issued require a public hearing. It's an amplified Section 61 process.

So, this today is an exercise designed to provide to the public information about the nature, specific nature, detailed nature of the project as it now stands and the changes that have been made. So, that by the time we get to that public hearing process, people will have not only the things on our website to look at but the presentation and the commentary that goes forward today to absorb and think about as they formulate their own questions.

The two are going forward in parallel, although as you mentioned the site design is separate from the section -- site design approval is separate from the Section

2.1

approve the site changes and the site design as it presently stands and to approve the Section 61 Findings comes at the end of this process after we have received that public comment and held that public hearing. Is that the context in which we are working?

MR. ZIEMBA: That's right. What I

MR. ZIEMBA: That's right. What I wanted just highlighted that today's presentation is focused on the design on-site facility. Discussions regarding the off-site infrastructure they continue in earnest.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. Great.

14 Thanks.

MR. ZIEMBA: Bob?

MR. DESALVIIO: Thank you, John.

Good morning, Commissioners. I'm joined today
by Chris Gordon. And also Jacqui Krum will
probably be joining us shortly. She is over at
your offices on another matter and will join us
as soon as she can.

Before I begin, I would like to publicly acknowledge Commissioner McHugh. I know I believe today is your last public

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

meeting. And I wanted to just say on behalf of the Wynn team, thank you so much for your service to the Commonwealth.

I certainly know that when you start gaming in a new jurisdiction, I've now been through this in New Jersey and in Pennsylvania and now here, it is an extremely difficult job. I think you did an amazing job all the way through on your term. And just on behalf of the licensee, I want to say thank you for your service. And I believe you did a great job for the Commonwealth.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you very much, Mr. DeSalvio.

MR. DESALVIO: So, let's kick this right off. I'm going to turn this over to Chris Gordon, who's got a number of updates on permitting.

MR. GORDON: Thank you. We're going to walk you through the status of our permitting. As you know, the MEPA certificate has been issued and as was mentioned, we are now working on our Section 61 Findings.

The highway department, the Gaming

Commission, DCR, DEP and others going along well. Not completed yet, it involves several public meetings, it involves a number of different issues, but we're on course. And that's going well.

The other big permit we're working on is the Chapter 91 permit, which you've heard about in the past. The relevant news today is the comment period ended. We received five comment letters. We responded to those comment letters today.

The responses go back in. Good comments, good responses no big surprises. So, we expect that process to keep going. So, we're on schedule for the Chapter 91 work as of today.

Other work, the site plan review by the city of Everett, the dates are on the slide. But we did apply for, had several meetings and did gain approval from the city of Everett for the site plan approval. So, we've completed that step in the process since we met last.

Also, the notice of intent, which is

the language for the Conservation Commission in Everett, we also applied for that. We had a series of public meetings and also gained approval for that. And the appeals period has ended. So, we are through both site plan and Conservation Commission in the city of Everett with the plan that you're going to see today.

Site remediation, as you know, one of our first actions is to get going on the cleanup of the site. About 2000 samples have been finished, soil and water samples. I'll show you a plan in a second of that. Also the release abatement measures plan has been filed and accepted by the DEP. So, that work is complete.

Plans and specifications were developed. And we're also pleased to say that we bid that work out. And a national firm that happens to be local, Charter Contracting, was selected to be our remediation contractor. It is a highly qualified remediation contractor.

We also were asked to do a public involvement process, the PIP process which is done by petition. We did that. We had the

1 public meetings. We filed the documents and 2 we've satisfied that requirement and we'll 3 continue to satisfy that with future updates to 4 the community as well as through our electronic communication. And the contract --5 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Sorry. Maybe you 7 were going -- Go ahead. What were you going to 8 say? 9 MR. GORDON: They've started. 10 mobilized. They're out there. If you went by 11 the site today, you would see the project sign 12 is up. The job trailers are there and the 13 surveyors are working. So, as soon as the 14 paperwork is all properly filed, they'll start 15 actual physical work hopefully in November. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is something 17 which is sometimes misunderstood. Apparently, 18 the remediation can go forward prior to the 19 Section 61. This is not part of your 20 construction. This is remediation which can go 21 forward on its own schedule, which is good 22 news. 23 MR. GORDON: That's correct. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

MR. GORDON: And the remediation is about four months. I say about because you never quite know until you get in the ground.

Winter doesn't stop this. So, they will keep going. So, assuming they start digging any day now, it's about four months until we are done. We had two public meetings as requested, one in Everett, one in Charlestown to talk primarily about trucking. A lot of interest in where the trucks go, how the trucks are secured. So, we've done that.

And I think they were very successful. We talked about where the soil goes to certain landfills, how it gets there. So, we went through a lot of the process on that.

We also talked about dust control, dust monitoring, work hours, and a lot of the things that you'd expect a community to want to know about. So, we've done that and now we continue to implement that. So, even though we've talked about it, now we've got to do it. So, the dust monitors are going up. The trucks are being prepared. So, we think we're in good

shape on remediation.

This is the plan. We actually like this. That shows the 2000 samples where everything was sampled. It's amazing the site is still there after all that digging, but all of those samples are done. All of those samples are tested. We have the lab reports. So, we know exactly what's down there.

This plan shows the three areas we call the hotspots. One is here, one is here, and one is here. Those are the three worst areas of contamination.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Could you do that again, Chris? I'm sorry.

MR. GORDON: Yes. There is two.

There's two that are really excavation and one that is in situ stabilization. And I'll get into a little bit more detail, but these three are the worst contamination on the site.

And not surprisingly, if you look at the historic photos, it's where the largest tanks were or the largest delivery vehicles were. So, a lot of the tanks may have leaked. There may have been other issues.

These two areas get excavated. This area gets what is called in situ stabilization, which is a soil mixing process. In summary, at the end of the next four months, these three sites will be fully remediated. And that means the site is dramatically cleaner than it is today.

It'll still have the normal soil issues for construction. The site isn't spotless then, but the worst of it is by far will be gone at the end of that process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Does that mean that the digging and excavation is confined to the two pink areas?

MR. GORDON: Well, there's digging here, but it's in situ stabilization, which means we're going to mix the soil with an additive. And that's going to stabilize the soil and calibrate the pH level. So, there will be digging here but there won't be as much soil removal.

These two are pure removal. They put sheathing around it. You remove the soil.

And it's going to go to either New Hampshire to 2 a landfill, Michigan or to one up in Canada 3 depending on the nature of the soil. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Was there testing 5 done of the waters either of the inlet or right 6 on the --MR. GORDON: Every one of these dots 8 is a test. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. I was 10 looking at it backwards. 11 MR. GORDON: That's all in the 12 And some of those are samples from the 13 ground, the dirt where they actually go down 14 and take a sample. And a lot of those are 15 water samples. But at each point where there's 16 a dot, that was actually a soil sample in the 17 soil in the inlet testing the sediment. 18 Then we also did some groundwater 19 testing on the edge as well to understand the 20 migration and quality of the groundwater. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And there weren't 22 any places underwater that needed to be 23 excavated, apparently? 24 MR. GORDON: Not in this phase. We

are still working out with the DEP later in the future whether there's any work in the water to deal with some of the sediment that's there.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

MR. GORDON: This is just to give you a sample. This is a solar powered dust monitor. There's going to be eight of those around the site.

They are electronically tied into the phones and the computers of all of the staff on site. So, if there's any dust that exceeds any of the normal tolerances, the project stops. Work is modified to reduce the dust. However, if it's just a windy, dusty day they'll stop anyway.

These are meant to monitor what's going on with the dust, which has been a bit question of the communities whether or not this stuff is going to glow around. It isn't going to blow around, but just in case it did, we can track it.

These are the trucks. What's important here is they are lined. Each truck is lined. The liners are put over the

2.1

material. That material is sealed. Then there 2 is another liner that goes on top of the truck 3 That truck is put over, that's sealed. And then the trucks are tracked by GPS so we 5 know exactly where they go. 6 So, we have approved three truck 7 routes that really get them to 93, which is 8 where they want to go. Then we'll track them 9 from there. There's a bill of lading when you 10 start. There's a bill of lading when you finish. So, we can track that. 11 12 We're also going to spot check. 13 Quite frankly, we're going to have vehicles out 14 there checking to see where they go, what they 15 do. So, we've got a very close control on the 16 trucking. 17 It's five to six trucks a day on 18 It peaks at maybe 15 during the 19 remediation, but it's a relatively small 20 number. 21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Chris, are 22 those volumes what was initially anticipated in 23 general terms? 24 We're about where MR. GORDON: Yes.

we were for the volume. Again, once you get in the ground, you're never sure exactly what it is, but it's not going to vary very much. So, we're pretty much where we were from a volume point of view.

Design, and Bob is going to walk you through it in much more detail in a minute, but I want to give you an update on the design process. We view the project in four packages, the onsite work. We've got the foundation and the garage, the hotel, what we call the podium, which is really the gaming and the food beverage and the site and marine.

The foundation and garage package is the furthest along. We're going to submit that in the next month or so to the city of Everett to start the building code review. So, the foundation and the garage work is far along in design. It's near a point where they can do a detailed code review of that because that's the first thing we're going to build.

The hotel tower is second. That's very far along. This means a lot of detail that Bob's going to show you about exactly how

the tower lays out. Those drawings are quite complete. You'll see that in a minute.

Podium is starting to catch up. The podium is the hardest work, because it's all of the gaming, all of the food and beverage, all of the retail, the back of house. That is the next piece that will fall into place.

Then of course the site and marine work will be the last to get built. But that's also coming along with landscaping and the waterfront and that sort of stuff. So, the design package is far along.

Off-site infrastructure, a key part of our mitigation commitments. The design team was selected. The last time we met, we were in a process of selecting a design team. AECOM, who is a major national highway as well as other engineering firm.

They were picked with a full array of sub-consultants to work on this. And they're just starting to get there. So, the survey will get done this fall. They're working on roadway safety audits. They're getting going with the highway department in

the different cities and towns and all of the mitigation work. So, they're ramping up quickly and will be ready for -- to start the permitting process for all of the off-site mitigation.

A little separate, as you know, we started Sullivan Square early because it was a key part of our licensing. So, Howard/Stein Hudson who is a separate but equal transportation firm is doing the work on that.

We have a meeting, for example, tomorrow we have a meeting with -- Actually, this afternoon we have a meeting with the city of Boston's highway department on the next discussion about Sullivan Square.

So, that's a little before 25
percent design. We're probably at 20 percent
design now. We'll meet with the city of
Boston, get their feedback and keep going
through that design process.

Site preparation, we went out and if you remember the site from your early site tours, it was a mess. It had broken down fences and railroad ties and junk cars and

2.1

everything else.

We literally just cleaned up the site. We weren't doing construction. We went out there with a contractor. Cashman was selected through a process and we trucked off a lot of the debris that was sitting on the site. The barrels and sheds and everything else was properly disposed of and taken care of.

We put up a new fence. We put up a project sign. Now we've got a gate guard. So there's actually some control on the site. So the entire site is fenced. The entire site is cleaned. Now we can actually get started.

So, if you went out there today, it looks as good is a vacant lot can look. It looks much better than it did.

Project schedule, there's a number of slides here because we wanted to include them, but I'm not going to walk you through that. There's like 10 slides of the bar chart.

But let me give you the highlights of the six-month schedule you've got there. We are still on course with our longest permitting lead, which is the Chapter 91. We expect by

the February timeframe to be through the Chapter 91 process.

And that would mean after that there's two other permits, Army Corps and water quality that have to fall into place after Chapter 91. So, it's probably an end of February kind of timeframe to be permitted. We would then expect a March or April start of construction.

Then if that happens, as you know from our prior dates here that puts us in the second half of '18 to finish. So, we're on track for that. We certainly are gearing toward that. We are ramping up quickly.

We're interviewing construction
managers. And we want to pick somebody by
January to build the building. So, we hope to
have a contractor on board by January. The
remediation is moving along as we mentioned.
So, we can go through the details but that's
sort of the big picture of where we are on the
construction.

And the off-site mitigation, again, a lot of detail there. But the bottom line is

```
it's got to be done before we open and we know
2
     that. So, we've got to make sure that all that
 3
     roadway work is done before we open.
 4
                So, I'll just click through these
5
     quickly but there is a whole bunch of details
 6
     there. And we've shared these with Jason and
     the PMA team. And we're certainly happy to
8
     engage any discussions about those.
9
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does anybody have
10
    particular questions about the schedule?
11
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
                                       You were
12
     going to just run through some of the
13
    highlights, is that what you just said?
14
                MR. GORDON: That's what it was.
15
    We're happy to get into more detail.
16
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That would be
17
     good.
18
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: He just did.
19
    were just saying you just did, right?
20
                MR. GORDON: We can get into more
21
     detail if you would like.
22
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Because it's
23
     difficult to read.
```

MR. GORDON: These bar charts, we

wanted to submit them for information, but you're right. They're not what you really want to dive into.

The big activities now are on sort of parallel tracks. The design team, and Bob is going to introduce some of those folks in a minute, but the design team is deeply engaged designing all day every day. And there's conference calls and meetings and a lot of work going on with the design team. So, that's gearing up toward a March start of construction.

The permitting team is very busy and they are working on all of the Section 61 stuff that John mentioned, the Chapter 91 work, additional work with Everett. And then that will start to roll into all of the off-site permitting work. The site remediation is really site prep, site remediation which we talked about.

And then there's a lot of preparation for demolition, preparation for the highway work. So, that's sort of the big activities going on now. Behind the scenes, we

2.1

are putting construction contracts together, 2 insurance, the labor agreements, all of that 3 stuff is being lined up so we'll be ready to go when we go. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Chris, I know 6 you mentioned this before and probably it hasn't changed, but remind us in general. 8 critical path goes through at this point the 9 remediation obviously. MR. GORDON: No, it goes through 10 11 Chapter 91. 12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Chapter 91. 13 MR. GORDON: It goes through Chapter 14 Then it goes to the Army Corps permit, 15 which can't be issued until after Chapter 91. 16 Then it goes to as deep as we can get in the 17 hole to put the caissons in. The caissons 18 being the foundation for the tower. 19 Then it comes back up through the 20 Then it's sort of a tie between the tower. 21 tower and the back of house because we want to 22 get the climate control system on about a year 23 before we open because of the quality of

24

finishes in the building.

1 So, between the hotel tower and the 2 back of house cooling and heating system that's 3 sort of going to be tied for who gets done 4 first. And that'll be the critical path of 5 getting open. 6 The most work is in the podium, but 7 the good news there a lot of that stuff can be 8 done off-site. In other words, building the 9 podium is not the hard part. The hard part is 10 populating it with all of the gaming equipment, 11 all of the technology, all of the furniture. 12 And a lot of that can be prepared well in 13 advance. 14 Was there more detail on the 15 schedule? 16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No, that was 17 helpful. I just struggled to read it even with 18 glasses. 19 MR. DESALVIO: Yes, that's a tough 20 chart. 21 MR. GORDON: If you want we can have 22 a meeting and really get into the nuts and 23 bolts, because there's a lot here that's 24 important. Let me just get through these and

we'll get to the next piece of this.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But at this point, you're still predicting the later part of 2018?

MR. GORDON: Correct.

MR. DESALVIO: We've been using second half of '18 because it just depends on so many different issues whether it's permitting, getting the GC on board, having them go through their methods and how they're going to get the building built.

MR. GORDON: Bob.

MR. DESALVIO: Great. The next section we want to talk about his project diversity. The next slide has the numbers.

Before I get into the numbers though, I want to acknowledge Roy Peterson is here from Jacobs.

Roy, where are you, if you could just stand up.

This is a team effort. I get to

This is a team effort. I get to report on the numbers but in reality there are folks that are making this happen. The Jacobs team has been very instrumental in this in trying to bring some new folks into the team. This is difficult because you've got to

identify. You've got to qualify. You've got 2 to integrate them with your staff. They've been very good about working with us on that 3 along with the team in Las Vegas, Karina 5 Ashworth, Roger Thomas, DeRuyter Butler. And 6 of course championing this has been Jenny Peterson working alongside Jill and your team 8 and the access and opportunity committee to make this happen. 9

But this is truly a team effort and I want to acknowledge that because I know Commissioner Cameron you asked me at the end of the last meeting when we did the update, do you think we're going to see more progress as we move into the next quarter.

And I'm really happy to report today that we've made some really good progress along this front. This slide, actually I'll take you through a few of the highlights. For the MBEs now we've got eight contracts, about \$2.6 million worth of work.

We added a line in here. Not only do we have the percentage of total contracts, but we added what's in the contract pipeline,

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1 because these things happen over quite a period 2 of time between finding companies, making sure 3 that they are qualified, making sure they apply for a license with the MGC, making sure they 5 have the designation for what type of firm they 6 are. So, some of these take actually 8 So, what we did is was we added up not 9 only what we've got, but some things in the 10 pipeline to give you a better sense of how the 11 design side would play out. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is the 9.4 13 cumulative? 14 MR. DESALVIO: Yes. So, that right 15 now -- I'm sorry? CHAIRMAN CROSBY: In other words 16 that's 6.8 plus 2.8 or something like that. 17 18 MR. DESALVIO: Right, that's 19 correct. You've read that correctly. So, what 20 we're saying is our goal was 7.9. And if 21 everything happens that's currently in the 22 pipeline, we'd look like we would come in about 23 9.4 percent. Again, these are not exact 24 because this is a moving target as we are doing

1 this. 2 On the WBEs, three contracts about 3 In the pipeline total would get us to about 7.6 on a 10 percent goal. 5 And on the veteran front, these are 6 fairly significant contracts about \$3.1 million. If we add this all up, we are almost 8 through the pipeline in this particular case. 9 It would total out to about 6.6 percent on a 10 one percent goal. That's because we wound up 11 with a couple of significant contracts. 12 So, when you blend that out overall, 13 it looks like about 13 total M, W and VBE 14 contracts, about \$7.6 million. With everything 15 in the pipeline, it would play out to about 16 23.6 percent over a goal of 18.9 percent. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is of awarded 18 contracts, percent of awarded? 19 MR. DESALVIO: Pipeline is not yet 20 So, this includes both. awarded. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is just out 22 of curiosity, does the pipeline have everything

in it or is there stuff that isn't even in the

23

24

pipeline yet?

MR. DESALVIO: For the design part, 1 2 we're through the large part of it. There may 3 be some additional design pieces that come 4 along. But I think Chris we are about \$50 5 million all in on this design work. 6 MR. GORDON: There will be some 7 future opportunities during construction, but 8 this is the big chunk. 9 MR. DESALVIO: The heavy lifting on 10 this is upfront. Again, please understand it's 11 a moving target. So, these are not exact until 12 you literally get through and actually place 13 these contracts. But the point is that 14 significant progress has been made on this 15 front. We're happy to report that. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But the 16 17 denominator in these numbers is the total of 18 the design cost. 19 MR. DESALVIO: Roughly \$50 million. 20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. 21 MR. DESALVIO: Now the next charts, 22 I am not going to go into these in depth for a 23 couple of reasons. This is now the contracts 24 awarded on the construction phase.

```
1
                So, as you can imagine we haven't
2
     done the large contract for the GC for the
3
     whole project. So, we only have a very small
     amount. You can see the numbers on this chart.
5
     This was just Cashman's work to clean up the
 6
     site.
                So, even though it's a small amount
8
     of work, we were required to start reporting.
9
     And now remediation will follow right behind
10
     that.
            That is a large contract. Chris
11
    mentioned Charter earlier. They are a
12
    minority-owned firm. And they just got a very
13
     large contract, but it's not reported yet.
14
     That one will be coming in our next report.
15
     was too new for this.
16
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: They are also
17
    based in Boston?
18
                MR. GORDON: Yes, they are based in
19
     Boston.
20
                MR. DESALVIO:
                               That's correct.
21
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But even
22
     though it's a small amount, the numbers are
23
     good.
24
                MR. DESALVIO: The numbers are good.
```

The numbers are good.

MR. GORDON: As Bob mentioned, the Charter contract is over \$5 million. And that will dwarf these numbers when we put that in the numbers.

MR. DESALVIO: So, we're off to a good start there on the construction phase.

And then also since Cashman began cleaning up on the site, we were required to start our workforce participation numbers as well. So, it was good for us to get in the habit and the practice of getting that started out on the site.

As you can see here, again, just a small amount of workers. On the minority front we had four workers. We had one woman out there, no veterans yet but again this was just a contract with a few people out there working on the site. And it gave us the ability to get this whole process started.

The next topic I want to talk about was community outreach. I won't go through all of these because we had so many events during the quarter. But basically, we are all over

the place trying to meet and greet and find

people. Whether it was community meetings,

career showcases, the Greater New England

Minority Supplier Development Council, meeting

with the trades, we did a service day where we

went to the Kennedy Center Daycare in

Charlestown. We did some paint work on the

project.

Everett, we were the prime sponsor of Villagefest, which was a wonderful community event that was put on by Mayor DeMaria and the city of Everett. So, needless to say you can see from the list we are very active out there and engaging the community.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Bob, I want to just compliment you on one of the things you have listed on the events and outreach, which has been at the top of the list, the meeting with the local career centers.

I know Jenny has been going out with some of the women leadership of the building trades specifically going into the state career centers, making sure the staff who are interacting with people looking for work on a

daily basis are aware of -- think of construction opportunities and construction careers when you're coming in and thinking about where your next job opportunity might be.

So, kudos to her for that kind of outreach and doing in partnership with some of the leadership on our A and O committee that's pretty spectacular.

MR. DESALVIO: Yes. She has been really active in that. And I give her a lot of credit for advancing our numbers forward and will continue to do so. Thank you for acknowledging that Commissioner.

So, I'm going to switch gears and get into the design review. I want to start by bringing back up -- these were the renderings that I showed at the January meeting. So, this one is of course the daytime shot of the hotel tower design. It shows our really great location right on the Everett waterfront and our six and a half acre outdoor harbor area.

The next slide shows the nighttime shot to give you an idea of the proposed illumination of the building. And again, how

2.1

it sits nicely out on the waterfront.

part of the arrival sequence as you approach the porte cochere entry to the property. You can see it's nicely landscaped as it slopes down into the water area, and meets up with the harbor walk and where the water taxis will come in. I think it will give our guests arriving a very warm inviting sense of arrival.

The next shot is one we created.

This is back further as you come in off of
Broadway and as you enter the access road and
you're going past the podium area of the
property, before you get into where you would
make a decision to whether you're going into
self-park or valet. And it shows the tower
from the other side.

Again, we're really happy with the way the building presents itself from all of the angles. The design team has done an amazing job.

I want to move on to the site plan. This is a little bit of an enhanced version of the site plan probably from what you saw

previously. What's interesting to note is the heavy amount of landscaping. We are working with two different groups on this, Lifescapes International has worked with Mr. Wynn for many years on some of the landscape architecture that's been done on some of his award-winning projects.

But we also integrate Pam Shadley who has been a wonderful resource who knows the local area and the types of plant materials that we would use in order to create the living shoreline.

We think you're going to be very pleased with how the landscape design lays out. As a matter of fact, we are in the process of building a new complete site model and will be having that delivered out to our development office within a few months at which time we'll get you out there to have a look at it.

It's an integration of the new landscape plan along with the new building design. Because if you recall, the old model that we had had the previous tower. So, we really updated the entire model and will be

looking forward to showing you that at a later date.

A couple of more comments though that I'd like to bring up before we get to the actual floor plan of the building. In the new site plan, Chris mentioned this earlier, we raised the building up about 11 feet. Part of that was we eliminated one floor of the garage, but it also gave us the opportunity to do significantly less excavation and moving soil off of the property.

It also gave us better accommodation for future sea-level rise. And for now, we're up to, correct me if I'm wrong Chris, the 500-year flood mark. So, for us making sure that that building is safe and secure and up high enough was a critical part of the component. And we worked with our team and with Jacobs to make sure that we had what we thought was appropriate.

Now with that comes -- As you raise the building as you can imagine the complications come with that is how do you provide for all necessary ADA access. So,

2.1

that's something that we've been focusing on.

Jacobs has been very helpful with us in making sure that we comply with all local codes. And then recently Jacqui Krum reached out to David D'Arcangelo. And David, as you know, is the director for the Mass. Office on Disability.

We're going to set up a meeting with him at a later date as we secure all of the plans, review the ADA access. We just want to make sure the building is 100 percent completely accessible. And between the work that we do with Jacobs and any other suggestions we get as part of the process, we'll make sure that happens.

As part of that review, at the end of the retail esplanade, the building is now higher than it used to be. So, when you come out onto the deck, we've added an elevator that will now obviously take you -- anyone who would be in a wheelchair or who did not want to go down a set of stairs or a ramp, there will be an elevator that will bring you down to the event lawn area.

2.1

So again, I just wanted you to know that we are thinking a lot about this. And we want to make sure that this building is completely equipped for all ADA access as it rose in elevation.

The other thing is we added a turnaround lane at the very end -- Chris could point that out. -- at the very end out by the water. There was a couple of reasons for this.

In dealing with the city of Everett and their emergency management folks, we want to make sure that emergency vehicles could not only get to the far end of the site and be able to turn around and get back into the main area, we also made an arrangement so that ambulances could leave that turnaround and get out onto the harbor walk just in case there was any issues out there.

We can literally come off of the turnaround at the end, get out on the harbor walk. And that would get us all the way around the front of the property.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: With vehicles?

MR. DESALVIO: With an ambulance,

you cannot get a fire truck on the harbor walk, but we can get an ambulance out there. So, if anyone got hurt, because remember there's going to be bikers coming through on their bicycles, lots of folks walking. And the city thought it would be a good idea that if we ever needed to get an ambulance out front that turnaround will give us the ability to do that.

Also, it gives us the ability to get to the backside of the main ballroom, which is out at the end of the esplanade area right where Chris is pointing. We've got some area there for loading and unloading.

So, if we have to service any events that are out in the ballroom, we can very easily go down the back, go around the roundabout, drop off materials and get to that as well. So, it was really for lots of different accessibility areas.

Of course, that will be landscape screened from the rest of the harbor walk. But we thought that was a great addition to the site plan.

Now you're taking a look at the main

casino floor level. We are very pleased with 2 the development work that has gone into this. 3 This represents probably two years' worth of work. Chris, do you mind if I ask you to drive a -- starting out at the entry road on Broadway 6 and coming in, Chris is going right past --There's now an entrance and an exit for self-8 park underneath the building. We separated I'll talk about that a little bit later 9 10 on.

As you move around over to the hotel porte cochere entrance, Mr. Wynn and the design team have been working on a real amazing arrival sequence for what's going to happen in the lobby atrium area.

When you come into the property, you are able to access the retail and food and beverage esplanade from both sides all the way without actually going into the casino. And it leads all the way out to where the convention complex is out at the far end of the area.

And we made particular care to look at right where Chris is pointing now, if there was not an event going on in the ballroom and

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

you wanted to go out and see what was going on on the waterfront, the esplanade ends and then you're able to go past the ballroom and out to a deck area that takes you down to the event lawn.

And that is going to be gorgeous.

It's going to have windows that will overlook
the harbor walk. And we really wanted to make
that area of public accommodation extremely
special. So, people that are crisscrossing and
want to move through the site and view what's
going on outside can do so and pick up those
windows all the way at the end.

We've got 16 different retail stores. There's 12 food and beverage outlets throughout the property and a beautiful esplanade.

As you move past the arrival and go right into the main casino, there's a bank of elevators right where Chris -- that's the hotel bank of elevators that take you up through the tower. And then the area in yellow is of course the main casino area with its circulation shown.

We've been working a lot on the design of what that will look like. We added a buffet restaurant up on the top of the casino area right where Chris is pointing. To the right is lots of back of the house areas, our loading area.

The dark area right there where

Chris is pointing is the central plant. So,

we've got accessibility to the service yard.

Really the flow of how this building works and

how guests move through it and how we can

service our guests has really been thought out

very carefully over the last couple of years of

the design process.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Bob could you just highlight the main access points to the casino just as a refresher?

MR. DESALVIO: Right there. Then there are in the corners there are some elevators. That corner, the far right, Chris over here, down on that corner as well. Then if you move to the left to the bus arrival, right where Chris is pointing now, we have an area that is able to accommodate bus arrivals.

So, when you come in, there will be an elevator, escalator and some stairs that will get you up to the main level. And from there you can choose to either go right into the casino or you can go left and just go right into the retail esplanade.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. And those elevators are also coming from underneath obviously. If the patron decides to self-park, they can come into any of those four points, basically?

MR. DESALVIO: That is correct.

This particular slide shows what is the second level of the casino. If you start in lobby area, Chris, there is a set of curved escalators that will get you from the lobby level up to that second level.

And on the left side when you come up, there is a food and beverage outlet that'll probably be a three meal period restaurant that overlooks the atrium lobby.

On the right-hand side will be a bar area, a piano bar area that will be nice for entertainment and again, will overlook the main

1 lobby area.

As you move forward through, you now come into what is the second level of the casino and what we are calling the chairman's salon. So, that is for higher limit gaming. We have both tables and slots in that main area. This gives them a really very nice unique setting that overlooks the main casino floor.

And then as you work your way down, let's head down to where the sports bar is.

So, as you traverse down that side of the property, we've got a sports bar at the far end. And then we have a space -- I'm going to talk about this a little bit later when we get into the program changes. That's what we're looking at now for an ultra-lounge, which is something new. And I'll get to that a little bit later about what our thinking is on that.

And then just north of that Chris the poker room. We've got 95 tables in a poker room that sits above the main casino floor in its own area. Then the area immediately to the right is of course more back of the house, our

human resources areas, our offices.

In this particular case, I know you know most of these buildings wind up with basements, but we didn't set ours up that way obviously because of the parking underneath the building. So, we wound up with two level back of the house areas so we could accommodate all of the functions that we need to for the property.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Bob, you were here last winter. You well know that there ae many months when people are not going to be enjoying the harbor walk.

Have you given any thought to how you are going to get people who come by water taxi to the facility in bad weather? Are they just going to have to walk through the rain and snow?

MR. DESALVIO: If you go back one slide, Chris. Let's go back to the main level. That's even a better way to look at it. So, you can see where the docks are.

We purposely put the dock areas as close to that front porte cochere as possible.

Obviously, we will be highly monitoring and taking care of any snow removal issues. As matter of fact, we are going to be using a snow melt system for the access drive and a good part of it to make sure that we constantly keep that clear.

But obviously, clearing all the pathways, we'll have the abilities if we need to if it was bad weather to simply run people up with some of our staff and umbrellas if needed. You only have to traverse a short area and then you come up and you're underneath the porte cochere and into building.

MR. GORDON: This zig zag here, those are the ramps that deal with the tides. So, people that come off the ramp are going to end up right here. And then there's a very nice staircase to the front door. There's also a ramp that goes up there. So, if you come off the ramp, it's a very short walk before you're under cover.

MR. DESALVIO: As close as we can get. If need be in really bad weather, we'll umbrella it if we have to.

2.1

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But the portion of the traffic that you've assigned to water taxis is dependent on the ability to use this year-round, right?

MR. DESALVIO: Correct. We've had some discussion about this. It is very rare when they cut off completely water access from us say down into Boston Harbor. It happened, I believe, for a short period last winter in what was probably the worst winter we've seen in a long time.

But for most of the winters from what we understand and since our water taxis will be enclosed, we can operate so long as there is no ice or any issues in the harbor. If it becomes a safety issue, they cut off service.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I understand that. But I'm really following up on Chairman Crosby's question about the dock area and the accessibility. It's one thing -- If you're going to get six percent of your people coming to the facility by water taxi that's a lot of umbrellas.

1 MR. GORDON: The ramps are designed 2 to be ADA compliant. As you know, from the 3 downtown water facilities here with the tides that's tricky. So, we've got a very similar 5 ramp you see at Rowes Wharf, Logan Airport. So, the ramps will all be ADA compatible for 6 anybody to use. And they'll have to be 8 maintained. Of course, if there's an ice storm 9 or anything like that they'll have to be 10 cleared like any sidewalk or any other access. 11 I hear you. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 12 Okay. 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Bob on that 14 slide, what is that C at the very front of the 15 -- at very middle mezzanine. Is that a 16 skywalk? MR. DESALVIO: 17 Those are stairs from 18 the main casino floor that leads up to the 19 chairman salon and the higher limit gaming 20 Those are curved stairways with a bar, a area. 21 lounge right at the base on the main casino level. 22 23 MR. GOROND: Another thing this 24 allows us to do is the white space is double

height, which is very unusual. Most of the casino floor will be double height with a very ornate grand ceiling and columns. So, it's going to look dramatically different than you might see in a lower ceiling casino.

MR. DESALVIO: Okay. As we move up, now this is the third level on this particular level, you can see in the reddish color as you come off the main set of elevators, we have our hair salon, our gym. We have an indoor pool area and we have a very large spa operation. That's become a signature operation for the Wynn facilities both in Las Vegas and Macau.

So, we are working diligently now on the interior design. We think that will be a tremendous amenity for our particular property. So, on that floor, the rest of the floor is primarily back of the house, but we still have some office space up there.

The indoor pool, we decided to do the pool indoors, but we do have glass panels that slide and would open up in good weather. So, you take in advantage of the views of the harbor. Because here you are up above the

1 porte cochere and looking right out into the 2 harbor area. 3 MR. GORDON: And you're also on the 4 green roof. 5 MR. DESALVIO: And we've got green 6 roof below that. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I didn't quite 8 realize how far along you were. Have we talked 9 with you about -- This is really getting into the details but -- the GameSense location, 10 11 where our office is going to be, the state 12 police? 13 MR. DESALVIO: Yes, that is part of 14 the presentation that I'm going to get to in a 15 little bit. We could probably just do it now. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's all right. 17 MR. DESALVIO: Let's go back to the 18 main floor. We worked alongside with your 19 staff on picking locations. The GameSense 20 office is going to be right about where that 2.1 red dot is. 22 So, we wanted it centrally located. 23 So, you've got this bus arrival area here. 24 You've got the end of the retail esplanade.

So, that gave us a good location that was close to where all the action would be on the casino 3 floor but not actually on the floor. Kind of similar to where -- I think of Plainville where it's close but not directly right in the middle of it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Where is the access point from the garage?

MR. DESALVIO: There is one right here. So, you've got elevators up from the garage. This is where the bus operation is. You've got anyone who comes in the front or is on the esplanade and you're going to wind up right in this same location.

So, it's really a nice high-traffic We showed it to Mark. He's been sent area. the plans. He wanted to make sure the front was open so it's inviting for the front. there's a private area for the counseling, any counseling issues that's more of an enclosed area.

Also your question about the Commission and state police offices, they are generally right in here. Those plans have been

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

sent to Bruce Band. We met last week, state police have reviewed. We went through with Bruce and reviewed the travel paths for where any cash would go and making sure that we highlighted safety and making sure that protection of assets was front and center.

We've given them full design development documents for that. We received a series of comments back from Bruce, state police. We've already incorporated those changes in the plan and all that has been done.

Chris brings up a good point. The lottery, we have the requirement for eight units. So, what we've done is found high-traffic areas here and over here near central places where people would go to and from.

We've located the lottery terminals. So, we'll make sure that that is covered as well.

So, we can advance probably to the parking levels. Oh, hotel tower was next.

What we did is we wanted to show you a typical floor of the tower. So, starting from left to right, Chris is now pointing to the end suites.

Those are up and down the entire tower

2.1

including up at the top of the building.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's for the Commission, right?

MR. DESALVIO: The Commission will be able to tour and take a look at them, I'm sure, once they are built. And at the top of the towel we do have two that are two-level. So, those will be some really special suites at the top of the tower.

Then as you move there, Chris is pointing to what is called the parlor suites. Those are going to be spectacular, great water view out towards the front of the building. The rest of the floor then has a mix of kings and doubles.

We've got obviously some of the darker areas are the back of the house areas. We've got back of the house where Chris is pointing now. And then of course the main circulation through the elevator core.

As you know, the rooms -- This is where Mr. Wynn was very proud of this design work and truly bringing back the era of the grand hotel. The minimum hotel size, 610

2.1

```
1
     square feet. These will be by far the nicest
2
     guest rooms in the region. We think that
 3
     they'll be very well received whether it's
 4
     through meeting and convention guests or our
5
     casino guests.
 6
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What is a standard
7
     luxury suite?
8
                MR. DESALVIO: You mean outside of
9
     Wynn?
10
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
                                  Yes.
11
                MR. DESALVIO: Like a high-end
12
     luxury quest room in most hotel are 350 maybe
13
     to 400 square feet, just depending on usually
14
     the age of the property. The older the
15
    property the smaller the rooms. But even new
16
     ones that are built, very rare you would see
17
     anything outside of Las Vegas that would
18
     approach 600 square feet.
19
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Wow.
20
                COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: What's an
21
     attachable room?
22
                               So, we can connect if
                MR. DESALVIO:
23
     there's families and you need to connect
24
     through an interior door. So, we have those
```

1 So, sometimes those are positioned near suites so a one-bedroom suite can become a 3 two-bedroom suite or if somebody rents a king and let's say wants a double-double next to Then we can attach all of the way through.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is there any gaming on any one of these rooms?

MR. DESALVIO: Not on the hotel tower, no. The next series of diagrams show the parking garage. Just some things to note that are new in the process. We dramatically increased the amount of circulation flow at the arrival sequence and giving us more capacity there.

A couple of the comment letters came in, they wanted to make sure that traffic wouldn't back up out towards Broadway or the street. So, what we did is we pushed further into the garage to create more opportunity for circulation and get the cars in.

As I mentioned earlier, we separated the in from the out of the garage. Originally, when you saw our plans, it was all in that same

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

area. So, now -- And Chris if you could just point to where the location. That's in and then out. And we've set these up with speed ramps for accessibility and getting in and out of the garage quickly.

The next floor this shows you as you're now migrating down. This is level B2. Then the next floor is B3 in the garage. So, we are now three levels under the building.

As far as now I'm going to move into the program update. So, you've got a slide and I want to make some special comments.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Before we leave the site, could I ask a couple of questions?

MR. DESALVIO: Sure.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: There have been some questions about how to get a feel for the height of this building. I know we've talked in the masse. We've talked about its relationship to the height of the nearby windmill for example.

Is there any way for people who are interested in thinking about the height and the

width to get some indication of what that's going to look like? Balloons on a string for example?

MR. GORDON: The nearest to height, and this may not answer your question, but you're correct. The windmill when the blade is at its highest point is almost exactly the height of the building by coincidence. And next-door there is the tallest smokestack is 500 feet. And we're 386 feet. So, we're 115 feet shorter than the tallest smokestack. We're just about the right height of the windmill.

So, that is just a general rule of thumb if that helps. We haven't done anything like mark up the height because it'd pretty tough at that height.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I know construction wise you can't put up a markup. That's helpful. It might be helpful to answer some of those questions to think about balloons for example on a calm day. And to allow people just to take a look at it to satisfy themselves in relationship to the other things that are

1 there.

MR. GORDON: Some of our computer models allow us to bring the lens back and you can actually see the building on the site. So, for example, some of the rendering you saw were up close but we can do the same thing by pulling the lens back and look at what the building actually looks like there.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I think that would be helpful.

MR. GORDON: For example, the Everett planning board asked us to do a rendering as you drove south on 99, which we never really thought of. So, we did it, and you can see it. So, we don't have it here but in other words you can see coming South down 99 you can see the tower to the right. At least for the planning board, it was very helpful.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I was just going to say we're headed toward a public meeting and a public discussion. These are questions that are already surfacing. So, it would be helpful to do some of that in advance so that people could see, could really see.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What it would look 2 like from Somerville, from Assembly Square, 3 from Charlestown coming across the bridge, if 4 it's not a big deal, I think that would be 5 interesting. 6 MR. GORDON: The building is 7 modeled. I don't want to speak too fast here, 8 but we can drop into the model. We've done it 9 for several locations the planning board asked There's not reason we couldn't do it in 10 11 other locations. So, let's look at that and 12 see how many different spots we can do it from 13 as you approach the site from different 14 locations. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think that would 16 be a useful addition to the public 17 conversation. 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: The other 19 question, I'm looking at the questions that's 20 in the packet, you'll see it, is the lighting. 2.1 The folks were interested in what the lighting 22 will look like during the day and at night. 23 So, if there's a way to demonstrate that that 24 may be helpful as well.

1 MR. GORDON: Let me show you one 2 slide here that I think is coming up, this one. 3 One of the things that we're working with the city of Everett is the two lighting plans. 5 One is photometric plan of the 6 ground-level lighting. Is it safe? Is it 7 adequate? Does it feel like everybody feels 8 comfortable walking around? 9 The other one is lighting up the Because the towers like this are 10 tower. 11 typically lit so you can see them. That's the 12 point of being able to see them. So, we're 13 working with the city of Everett to try to mark 14 that up so they can understand what that's 15 going to look like. And we're happy to share 16 that with Commission of course as well. 17 The first one is easier. The first 18 one is a series of fixtures, foot candle 19 counts, locations that's more technical. 20 second one is more like this where you try to 21 figure what does it a look like at night. So, 22 as we develop that of course we're happy to

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes. I think

share that with the Commission.

23

that would be an important thing as well. The nightclub has been eliminated from the facility. Can we talk a little bit about that where the nightclub went?

MR. DESALVIO: Sure. We started and we had a little bit of this discussion back in January when we introduced the new hotel tower.

The original nightclub plan was about 25,000 or so square feet. It was out at the end of the retail esplanade. So, when we went back and started to do some design work with Mr. Wynn and the team, we started to really think about that and say now you've got 25,000 feet in a prime location at the end of the esplanade. And based on the liquor laws in the Commonwealth, it's very different. This is very different from Las Vegas.

So, now you've got a situation where a nightclub is in use Friday and Saturday nights, may be a third if you get an industry night. By the time people get out to their nightclubs after having dinner, it's now 10:00 or 11:000 at night. And here you've got to shut down early.

So, when you add up the total number of hours during a week that you would have that facility open and where it was located and the size of it, we thought that was not a very good use of space whatsoever.

So, in rethinking it, we repositioned the ballroom space which was located originally above the casino, we brought that down. We moved that particular space out to the end of the retail esplanade thinking that that space would be in use the better part of 200, 250 days a year from all of the meeting and convention and trade show and any other activity we've got.

It also gave us the opportunity to combine indoor and outdoor spaces for events. So, we started to think about things we might want to do a food and wine festival, an arts show, an antique show, some other event. Now we get the advantage of taking the outdoor six and a half acres of event lawn and combining it with what's now about 37,000 square feet of meeting and convention space.

And from our perspective and in

thinking about areas of public accommodation when we were thinking through our Chapter 91 license, we thought this is a much higher and better use of the space.

So, we made that decision back when we changed the hotel tower to shift that and move that program out to the end.

What happened after that is we had a -- That's kind of long story to this. And it brings us up to something that we were talking about as late as last week. We then started thinking about some of the areas that were left on the second floor after we had made that move.

At one point, we went through a series of exercises and thought we might add a theater. We might add a small theater to the second floor. As a matter of fact, it shows I think in some of the plans that have been submitted along the way. So, we give that a lot more thought.

As you can imagine, in our organization, every single square inch of this space gets evaluated. Mr. Wynn collects the

opinions of all of the operators. We really want to make sure we try to get it right.

So, we started thinking about what you do -- The theater was going to be relatively small. It was going to be 400 seats. You look at the cost of entertainment. You look at trying to move acts in and out of a second floor corner location of the building. It was extremely problematic. The cost of entertainment versus return versus the type of shows you could do. We fairly quickly came to the understanding that we didn't think that was in the cards.

And then -- Wait a minute,

Commissioner. Hold that thought for one
second. And then when I'm done, I'll tell the
whole story and then we can get back and answer
any questions you want.

So, the most recent thinking is that since we lost the nightclub space and we're not going to have a theater, what other amenity could we had to maybe replace the thought of the nightclub. The idea came to introduce an ultra-lounge concept.

Why this is so current is that right now we are converting a space in Wynn Las Vegas that is Tryst Nightclub now. And we're going to be converting that into more of a, what we're hearing from the nightlife gurus, is a much more current concept, which is a smaller ultra-lounge. A little quieter than your typical nightclub space, better for mingling. Better with probably the age group that would typically visit a Wynn.

It's not just for young people but it's for all of us to go visit. So, the current thinking is that we're going to be developing this new nightlife space in Las Vegas. It will be open early next year. We're going to get some great learning out of that.

And take this remaining space that we've got and develop this ultra-lounge concept as kind of a replacement for where we were originally with the nightclub. It's much smaller. I think we have about 8000 square feet or so for this space.

But the reason I'm going on about this is to kind of let you into the process

that we go through, the iteration that we go 2 through when we think about the building. As 3 we've been doing this over the last year and half, we've tried to come up with what's the 5 right concept for the marketplace. 6 So, that's the long-winded answer 7 about where we are in the nightclub world. 8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And I assumed 9 that you said this is Boston and a sports bar 10 would be a better use of that space. 11 MR. DESALVIO: We have that as well. 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That's what 13 I'm saying. I saw the sports bar. 14 MR. DESALVIO: We added that early 15 on. We said if we open this building without a 16 sports bar, we're probably in deep trouble. 17 So, that was something -- And by the way the 18 team is having a lot of fun developing that. 19 This is the first time that the Wynn 20 organization has really gotten into really 21 design and development of a very unique and 22 interesting sports bar. We've got some 23 wonderful ideas that will play out as that gets 24 shown to the public at a later date.

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I have another 2 question but before we leave this what's the 3 difference between a lounge and an ultralounge? 5 MR. DESALVIO: Ultra lounge is a --6 A lounge is typically where you would go to get a beverage, meet some folks. An ultra-lounge 8 is a little bit higher level of nightlife experience. You may put in a DJ. You might 9 10 even put in possibly a small live act. 11 going to have probably more opportunity for 12 booth seating. So, it just has a higher 13 elevated level of experience. That's typically 14 in the industry they call that an ultra-lounge. 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Great, thanks. We talked a little bit about the convention 16 17 space there at the end. And then the circular 18 area in the grass that used to have stadium 19 seating I think earlier is now called an event 20 space. Could you talk a little bit about that 21 and how that works now, what the concept is? 22 MR. DESALVIO: Absolutely. Early 23 development on, you are correct, it was going 24 to have some tiered seating. So, we had a

series of design charrettes with the folks in

Vegas that do the meeting, convention, banquet

facilities. And it came through loud and clear

that if you go ahead and rake it with some

permanent seating, it becomes very hard to do

multiple types of events.

So, the idea was they asked us if we could make it level. This way we could tent it. We could do all kinds of functions in there as opposed to just having it be set up as an amphitheater. So, we thought again higher and better use, better public accommodation in the space. So, the steps went away and we are now calling it an event lawn.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's helpful, thanks. I don't know when you get to the programming elements whether you're going to talk about --

MR. DESALVIO: That was going to be my next section.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Are we going to talk about public transportation? I know you've made a significant contribution to the MBTA operations, and I wanted to explore that a

2.1

little bit. Are you going to do that?

MR. DESALVIO: Yes, that is in one of my program notes coming up. We are going to talk about as it relates to the parking garage discussion.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Great, good.

MR. DESALVIO: So, let's go to the program chart. So, I would like to highlight a few items on this particular chart. First and foremost is that we are very pleased to say that after a couple of years of development of this program, there's basically about no change.

You can see it listed there. It ultimately comes in at about three percent.

But literally as we keep changing the building, those numbers go up and down slightly every time we move a wall or change anything. So, for the most part our program elements, other than the garage, have remained constant all the way through the process.

I'm also pleased to report that we spend a lot of time working with Mayor DeMaria and the team in Everett that is working on the

project to show them steps in the way about where we are with the project.

As you know, they are our host community. They are very interested in what is going on in the building. And we've had a series of meetings along with the Everett design team and their project team up through and including the mayor who I spoke with this morning about this. And he wanted me to relay onto the Commission that they feel very comfortable about where we are from a program perspective.

I mentioned earlier we met with all of your staff as we talked about things like the state police, the gaming offices, the responsible gaming. We talked about the lottery terminals.

You know we've increased the size of the hotel. The hotel originally was 504 rooms. It's now 629. The spa area, including the spa, the pool and the amenities and the hair salon, that space got a little bit larger as part of the process.

And the reverse of that is the

retail and the food and beverage got a little bit smaller. So, what you can see happening is we moved some of the square footage into hotel, spa and amenities because we thought that that was the right move for the market.

That's still by the way, we still have 16 retail stores as part of the operation which is a large number of retail stores for any one operation. And there's 12 food and beverage operations as part of it, which I don't believe has changed much at all I don't believe from the original application. I think we were in that 10 to 12 range when we were back proposing the project originally.

We of course made the elimination of the nightclub. Chris and I talked earlier about the glass walkway that was added around out by the convention space. This is the revised program that went through the MEPA process. So, this is the most current of the programs.

With that I don't know if you had any questions on program, I'd be happy to answer them. But we feel really good about

where we are from a program perspective and that basically it hasn't changed in terms of square footage overall minus the garage.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So, where is the ultra-lounge in this?

MR. DESALVIO: That would be in the food and beverage number. Any questions on that? And if not, the next I wanted to talk about parking.

As you know we made in our most recent environmental filings, we did make a change in the garage area. Our off-site parking number has not changed. That's been 800. It was 800. It still is 800. Overall, our parking number went from 4518 to 3736 with a reduction of 782 spaces. Again, I mentioned earlier that was when we raised the level of the building up and removed one level of the garage.

Again, we think there were some real benefits to doing that including the accommodations for sea-level change, less excavation.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Bob, excuse me.

That doesn't make the demand go away. What was the calculation in the demand that made you think you could get away with 782 fewer?

MR. DESALVIO: Because when we look at our model in terms of the traffic counts and the parking demand and having our consultants take a look at that, the number that we currently have accommodates our parking needs.

MR. GORDON: It exceeds it actually.

MR. DESALVIO: And it actually exceeds it through our analysis that we've done. Also, during all of the feedback that we got through the entire environmental process, I can't tell you how many letters, comments about trying to reduce the footprint of the parking garage and try to make more about accommodating public transit. And this became a theme that we heard loud and clear as we went through the environmental impact process.

So, you think about where we wound up -- Obviously, we have water taxi service to the property. We're going to be connecting to both Malden's and Medford's mass transit stations so we can pick up both the T and

commuter rail.

We added the orange line subsidy
that I know Commissioner McHugh just mentioned.
We think that is very significant. That orange
line subsidy, not only will it increase the
amount of trains that are available for
customers but we specifically added a piece
that would help us in the late-night hours, in
the evening hours where there's quite a bit of
casino traffic.

So, we started back with our original demand model to make sure that we had the number of spaces that we need for the project. And then we focused a lot of energy and attention on mass transit through both the orange line, the water taxi and our shuttle pickups. And we think we've got the right mix. And again just in covering that with the Everett team as well, they feel the same way.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But wasn't

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But wasn't that one of those comments precisely by MassDOT in terms of considering reduction of the parking?

MR. DESALVIO: We heard that across-

1 the-board.

2 MR. GORDON: There's the whole 3 traffic inducement issue, what's the right balance between enough and not too much? As 5 Bob said, our analysis which is in our 6 environmental filing, shows that we exceed what the demand projection is even with a reduction 8 in spaces. And it seemed to satisfy several different items. One which is we want to make 9 10 sure we have enough parking so nobody is 11 backing up and that sort of stuff. But it 12 isn't too much parking where it's going to 13 encourage people to drive.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Where did the original numbers come from?

MR. GORDON: There's a parking section in our FEIR and our SFEIR and it uses various national standards and codes to derive for hotels, food and beverage, casino, convention that sort of stuff. And it does a calculation of what the parking would be.

Then it factors in -- There's a number of different factors they use for both increasing and decreasing that based on

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

adjacency. And then in addition to that we added a couple of factors to make sure the garage wasn't full. We wanted to make sure there was some extra room so it wasn't packed. And even after all of that we've got in excess of that.

MR. DESALVIO: Commissioner just one other comment on that. We started out, if I'm not mistaken, we started out at about 2900 in the garage at the original application. Then through the design process, it grew and then came back down to where we actually wound up now back to the original number.

I think it was 2900 and I think now we are at 2936. So, it almost wound up going full-circle right back to where we started.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I get that.

But the fact that it grew and then shrunk

raises questions about why it grew and why it

shrunk and how plastic this number really is.

And I know we'll hear more from our consultants

about that.

And I recognize the increase in the water traffic that occurred throughout the

planning process. It went from three to six. 2 I recognize the extra trains on the orange 3 line. But the shuttle buses between Wellington and the facility and the other location, they 5 were always part of the mix. 6 MR. GORDON: That's correct. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So, I wondered 8 whether the improvements that you made are 9 somehow tied to the 792 decreased parking 10 spaces.

MR. GORDON: Not directly. They're indirectly. You're right. The number has settled out where we think it's the right number. The projections of the demand were always the same. And in some of our midstream filings, we far exceeded the demand.

And after thinking about it and getting some pushback through the environmental process, we brought it back closer to the demand. So, it's still above the demand.

But it isn't directly tied to if you add two percent here -- In other words, if you add more on the water shuttle that helps, more on the orange line that helps. But that didn't

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

drive exactly the 700 some odd space reduction.

2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I hear you. 3 Undoubtedly, you've given this a great deal of thinking but this is something that I think the Commission will look to our experts and a dialogue with you to make sure this number is

the best that we can project.

Obviously, all if these things are projections. And projections are not the reality until we see what the reality is. still it seems to me this is such an important element of the whole approach that we need to make sure we are confident that it's right.

First of all, we are MR. GORDON: happy to participate and go through that. Second of all, we are as worried as anybody about not having enough parking, because you don't want to be known as a place you can't park. We have gone through it very carefully and we're happy to share that with everybody.

MR. DESALVIO: Maybe that would be a good opportunity to bring up that last slide we've got. We did some comparables here. lot is made about various ratios about parking.

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

In this particular case, what we tried to do is get the most updated information we could. So, we plugged in our number, which is when you look at our total parking count versus the gaming positions, we wind up with a .82 ratio.

We got some information back about the MGM current program. And it looks like they're running at about .94. We now know the Plainridge number because it's now live. And they're at 1.2. But they also have to accommodate not only the gaming but also accommodate the racing at the same time. So, they show a little bit higher.

You probably heard over the years, industry numbers kind of floated around at that one-to-one ratio.

So, when you think of us in an urban setting which is very different than what would you find in some casino operations, and you look at our heavy focus on shuttles, water, mass transit and really trying to keep cars off the road, we're very comfortable with the .82 as part of the process. Trust me,

1 Commissioner, we have spent a lot of hours 2 looking at this. And hopefully we've got this 3 right. 4 MR. GORDON: For due credit, this 5 original version of this came from your 6 consultant which came from a company named Stantec who worked with the city of Boston. 8 We've updated it based on the new numbers but 9 the concept came out of a comment letter that 10 came in through the environmental process. 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. I know 12 you've put a lot of work into this. A lot of 13 thought has gone into it. And I guess all I'm 14 saying is I think the Commission needs to fully 15 understand how we got here and what the process 16 is. And we'll rely on our experts to work with 17 you to help us understand that. 18 MR. DESALVIO: With that we are 19 going to open up for any questions, any more 20 questions. 2.1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody? 22 MR. ZIEMBA: We also have our 23 consultants if you wanted to hear from them.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON:

Did our

consultants have anything to add of value to
inform us of this process? I know you've been
looking at it Rick.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Commissioner.

We have been talking with the applicant.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Rick, would just introduce yourself.

MR. MOORE: Sure, Rick Moore from
City Point Partners. As John mentioned
earlier, Ray Profilio and Frank Tramontozzi are
here, the architect and transportation
engineer, a civil environmental engineer.
We've developed some comments. We've shared
them with you. We've shared them with Wynn.
And I think they have addressed most of them in
a very reasonable fashion.

I think overall, our message is these changes -- We would agree with Wynn that these changes, the three percent you can look at individual changes but they are normal in this type of process as you move from the planning to the more detailed design. You would not expect not to have these kind of changes. And they're fairly modest. I think

they've identified them.

If we could just go to the site plan just a couple of points based on your comments. One comment that you made about the concern of the access from the water to the casino, particularly in winter and inclement weather which we talked about the past. Keep in mind that Wynn has committed to a transportation demand management plan that includes that six percent that will be monitored over time.

And if for some reason whether it be public transportation or the water taxi are out of kilter, there's provisions to go back and look at that. In fact, it is incumbent on Wynn to come up with plans to address that.

So, if people aren't coming because they're getting wet in the rain there is an opportunity for the Commission to negotiate and talk about how that may be corrected. They are committed to that six percent. And they need to do what they need to do to get there.

In terms of the site plan, I just point out just so you have a rough idea, the open area at the end here that's about a little

over two acres. The distance from the water to the front of the building is a little over a football field. It's a little over 300 feet. So, that's a fairly good size area.

We think moving the convention facility to take the position of the nightclub is a reasonable approach. And I think that will be a spectacular place for conventions.

One of the concerns we have, although it will be active more days than a nightclub for instance, there will be days when there are no conventions there.

And we wanted to make sure that the patrons of the rest of the facility felt comfortable getting access to what will be a fairly nice open space. You heard about the connection inside and the glass windows to make it comfortable for people to move out there particularly in nice weather.

And as was pointed out, there are also two other access points to the open space. So, we think that will work well. By and large the elimination of the nightclub and the moving of the convention makes a lot of sense to us.

In terms of the parking, this is not an exact science. And if we can go to that bar chart, there is not a lot of information on parking at casinos. And you have to be very careful in using parking numbers in terms of the context of where the casino is. Is it an urban location? Is it not an urban location?

So, I think that one parking space per the so-called industry-standard is a good place to start when you're planning a facility like this. But we're passed the planning stage. And Wynn as you have seen with all of the work they've done to move design forward, they are way past the planning stage.

And they've actually looked at numbers that apply to their particular facility. And as Bob has mentioned and Chris has mentioned, there is a natural tension not to put too much parking in because of the cost on the one hand, and to not park enough and discourage people from coming to your facility.

So, this is a natural tension in any kind of development process. And gives everybody basically the same reason to come up

with the right number. Based on what they've done, we believe that the .82 parking spaces per gaming position is a reasonable number and where they should be given those two issues of tension.

And if you look at the work they did to come up with their so-called peak demand, and you compare that to what they're parking on-site, they have about a little over 80 percent utilization rate. They do have some factor of safety.

And I think we think that factor of safety is reasonable. And when you convert it into a parking space per gaming position, it also seems reasonable. So, we're fairly comfortable that this is as close to the right number as you're going to get. And those are the main points that I would make.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. That's very helpful.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That was a good idea to bring you up. Any other questions or thoughts? It was really good presentation.

2.1

Page 94 And it's exciting to see this begin to 2 materialize. Thank you all very much. 3 Let's take a quick break before we 4 get to your last item. 5 6 (A recess was taken) 7 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are ready to 9 reconvene at 12:10. Ombudsman Ziemba, I think 10 you have another agenda item. 11 Thank you Chairman and MR. ZIEMBA: 12 Commissioners. I will briefly outline a 13 process for review of MGM's recent design 14 change by the Commission. 15 I recommend that we ask MGM to present its latest submissions, the notice of 16 17 project change document and its site plan 18 review application that was submitted to 19 Springfield at a Commission meeting in the very 20 near future, either on November 5 or November 2.1 12.

This presentation would focus on just what is included in this document. What I was hoping that could be accomplished through

22

23

this presentation is just to have MGM or its consultants walk through what is specifically in the documents. Then I would then further recommend that we ask MGM to provide a furthermore detailed and robust presentation at the Commission meeting on November 19.

MGM is currently working to finalize a significant amount of information about costs, economic benefits and employment opportunities that they want to furnish to the city of Springfield and to the Commission.

This further information will be available just before the meeting that we have scheduled on the 19th. In between the 19th and now, Gaming Commission staff and our consultants will review all of the information that received today including the notice of project change document and the site plan review document.

And we will be conducting our review of that but additional information will be necessary for our review. MGM has been made aware that we are seeking additional information. And I believe that that should be

2.1

forthcoming as soon as possible from the MGM staff.

We are taking a look at the design review as we just described as a process that is in parallel with our Section 61 review process. Counsel Blue at a prior meeting described how we are trying to fulfill our responsibilities under the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, the so-called MEPA process, to issue Section 61 Findings to ensure that we are providing prudent measures so that we are mitigating any potential impacts to the environment.

So, we are hoping to move that forward as quickly as we possible can. The information that has been presented to date will be useful in that regard.

In tandem with our review, we understand that the MEPA staff is now reviewing the notice of project change document that was submitted by MGM. And it's anticipated that MEPA may issue a final decision on that notice of project change document by 18 November. And therefore, a presentation on the 19th would

have some very timely information for MGM to further provide.

One further thing I would like to talk about in regard to the review is our ongoing effort to ensure that both the public is informed about changes that may be proposed by MGM, and that we also receive the input that is necessary for our review. Indeed, input has been the hallmark of our reviews to date throughout our review process for the applications, and now that we are into the next stage of our review.

As you know, we have received requests that we seek further input from residents of the city of Springfield and its officials. For example, earlier this week at a Springfield City Council meeting, councilors discussed asking the Commission to hear directly more from Springfield residents and from councilors. Another such request from Mr. Circosta is included in your packet.

I think what's important is that all parties should have the benefit of facts upon which they may comment. And the process that

2.1

I've just identified would enable all those involved and all those who are reviewing to have the information as soon as practicable so that they can begin their reviews while we work with MGM to get out as much information as they possibly can.

So, consistent with that the recommendation that we put forward regarding the Wynn review proposal that we create a section on our website that is dedicated to the ongoing review of MGM's potential design reviews that we follow that same process. That we put all of the relevant documents as we receive them at Commission meetings, and we put those in a central place so those out there can find the documents and have the ability to comment on that.

In addition, that we ask MGM to present information in a timely manner. We understand that they have some significant work in assembling documents and making sure it is in a presentable form. And we're going to be respectful of their need to make sure that they get out the information in the best way

possible.

But that said, I think that there is some value for getting out information as soon as it possibly could be put out there in a reasonable form. That's why I've recommended this bifurcated process on the fifth and on the 19th. Not all of the information is going to be available on the fifth. We will still be in the context of our reviews at a staff level.

But if MGM could at least present
the facts of what it submitted on the fifth, I
think that that would serve an important
function to educate the public and anyone else
out there that is hopefully trying to
understand the changes.

While our process is ongoing, we completely understand that there's a process that is going on at the local level within the city of Springfield, City Council. We carefully monitor their meeting schedule. We understand that they are taking all of these changes very seriously.

They are going to continue to get input from residents from the city of

Springfield. We monitor the press. We monitor a lot of different communications in addition to communications that are sent directly to us by city of Springfield residents.

So, in that regard, we recommend at least that initial step of assembling all of the documents, putting them in a central place on our website, collecting information in a similar manner as we have done throughout our review processes. And that would be a good method for us to both to inform and to receive input. As we go forward, and more information is made available, we can consider additional steps. But I think that's the recommendation that I have today.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: What is your timeframe for the comment period, John?

MR. ZIEMBA: I think it should be ongoing because the design review process could go on well after the Section 61 review process. So, I don't think that we have a final date on when that design review process will conclude.

I know that the city of Springfield is trying to do things as quickly as they can

but understanding all the information that they can and collecting information that they need.

But potentially, our Section 61 Findings could be issued in advance of final design.

And as we've seen from the Wynn presentation, design is an evolving process with all of these projects. Even while we're in the middle of construction, most certainly MGM will come up with some ideas that they think can improve their project. And we'll have to evaluate that in that context.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That certainly happened even with Plainridge.

MR. ZIEMBA: That's exactly right.

commissioner stebbins: I like that idea, obviously, sharing all the documents that come in. I think what will be helpful and maybe it's a conversation for Mike Sangalang is taking out the presentation portion that we get at these meetings from our licensees and segmenting out that piece of the video and attaching it to documents and information on the website so somebody's not trying to sit and listen to the whole meeting until the relative

information gets presented. 2 That's a great idea. MR. ZIEMBA: 3 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: We'll leave 4 that to somebody who's got a little more tech 5 savvy than you and I. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You heard that 7 That's a good point. Good suggestion. 8 There's been requests have come to 9 us about an opportunity for the public to 10 contribute. Did you include that in what you 11 just got through talking about? Is there a 12 time when we would offer the opportunity for 13 the public to talk to us? 14 MR. ZIEMBA: That could be 15 considered by the Commission. I think that the 16 near-term goal would be to collect as much 17 information and get it in a reasonable form for 18 people to provide comment on in advance of us 19 determining the final steps of how that should 20 be presented to the Commission. 2.1 People today can submit their 22 comments. And we're going to ask them for 23 their comments through our website, through

other methods. MGM certainly is aware of

comments. We ask them to provide us updates regarding their comments.

At least as of now, maybe it might be more of a beneficial task to focus on getting the information collected in a central place so that people have the ability to comment on the latest information. And for MGM to be able to provide at least some answers to the questions that numerous folks have been presenting to date, including us but the city council, the city administration and others.

But further public comment, we certainly have done that through numerous methods. Through direct public comment to the Commission that could be considered by the Commission at any time now or later.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. I'm mixed on this. There is a request in our book and there have been others that we do something in Springfield to give people an opportunity to talk. On the other hand, Springfield is going to be making this decision themselves.

The city of Springfield is going to be going through this same process of reviewing

2.1

the proposed changes. And maybe it's they who should have a public hearing. I don't want us to just ignore them. We do have a number of requests to have that happen. We are going to be having one because we were told to for the Wynn project. So, it's something we need to think about.

As you say, we don't have to decide it now, but we do need to decide it. Maybe it's something we ought to talk about with Springfield too. If they intend to have a public hearing, maybe there's no need for us to do that.

MR. ZIEMBA: We can certainly do more outreach to the city administration and others in Springfield and to MGM to determine exactly what is anticipated over the process.

I think what MGM is doing right now is they're trying to respond to the latest request for more information from the city of Springfield. Once they respond to that document request that would kick off a period of review by the city staff, which would then kick some time periods out of 45 days of a

public hearing by Springfield City Council.

But certainly we can move forward and talk to the administration in Springfield and MGM regarding what is anticipated in the near-term.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. Okay.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: John, one of the documents you talked about was the site plan review that gets submitted to the city.

And this week there was a story saying the city wanted more information for the site plan. In your conversations with the city, it would be great to kind of get their feedback or an estimate on timing to receive that material back. Or maybe in talking with our representatives from MGM here, figuring out the timeline for that piece of it.

MR. ZIEMBA: I think in conversations with MGM and Springfield that the response is likely due within days rather than weeks to that. But, perhaps all of the information won't be in the concrete form that was specifically asked for in the application.

But MGM is trying to make provision

for providing that information in a timely way. 2 They mention in the letter that we have a copy 3 of in the packet from Chairman Murren that the week of the 19th, predating our Commission meeting, there will be a lot of communication 5 6 with the city of Springfield on some of these key deliverables, on a lot of the economic 8 information and cost information that folks 9 have asked for. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Anything 10 11 else on this topic? 12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Are they 13 presenting at all or talking about the notice 14 of project change? 15 No. That wasn't due MR. ZIEMBA: 16 for today. What I was recommending is that we 17 could either bring them in on the fifth or on 18 the 12th to give us that presentation in 19 advance of the much more robust presentation on 20 the 19th. 2.1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This was just to 22 talk about what is the process of the 23 conversation or presentation going to be. 24 Anything else?

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No. That's 2 very helpful. Very thoughtful as usual. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are you finished, 4 Mr. Ombudsman? I am finished. 5 MR. ZIEMBA: 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It happens to be 7 right on time. It's now 12:30. We have one 8 item left on the agenda. I'm sorry. We have 9 one more item before we get to the last item. 10 We can get through racing -- It's not going to 11 take terribly long I think, right, Dr. 12 Lightbaum? Why don't we finish racing. 13 then we can decide whether we want to plow 14 through for fantasy sports or take a lunch 15 break. Okay, Alex. DR. LIGHTBAUM: Good afternoon Mr. 16 17 Chairman, Commissioners. The first item we 18 have on the agenda is a request by George 19 Brown, the chairman of the Mass. Thoroughbred 20 Breeders Association asking to run five races 21 at Finger Lakes in New York. 22 On August 20, the Commission 23 entertained a similar request but it was very 24 specific only if Suffolk Downs did not race.

Now we've obviously -- Suffolk is racing. Once they race Saturday, they will have raced nine Mass. bred races there.

When the breeders looked at the funds coming in, they have more money than they anticipated. So, what they would like to do is continue racing this year up at Finger Lakes. Do five more races \$35,000 each to get more money out to different members.

10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This would be 11 Mass. breds only?

DR. LIGHTBUAM: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And this is money from the Race Horse Development Fund carved out for the Mass. bred program.

DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes. They also get some money from simulcasting and entry fees but the majority of it comes the Race Horse Development Fund. They still anticipate having about half million dollars left over at the end of the year to carry forward, which this year they had the big influx with the money from the license fees that's a one-time deal.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: How long

5

6

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

does Finger Lakes keep racing? 2 DR. LIGHTBAUM: I am not sure but 3 obviously for the next five weeks. So, my recommendation is to approve this request. 5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think it's 6 a reasonable request. There was such a limited opportunity here in the Commonwealth to race 8 for the Mass. bred that I think they were able 9 to make this deal. Many of those horses are up 10 at the Finger Lakes anyway. So, I think it's 11 reasonable and one we should approve. 12 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair, 13 I'd move that the Mass. Gaming Commission 14 approve the request of the Mass. Thoroughbred 15 Breeders Association to run five restricted 16 Mass. bred races at Finger Lakes Racecourse in 17 New York in 2015 after the nine stake races at 18 Suffolk Downs is complete. 19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second, 21 Commissioner Cameron. Any further discussion? 22 All in favor, aye. 23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 24 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 2 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 4 have it unanimously. 5 DR. LIGHTBAUM: The next issue on 6 the agenda is just a letter to Mr. Alcott at Suffolk Downs. They made a request to change 8 their post time. This is one of the items that 9 the Commission had delegated authority to the 10 head of the Racing Division to authorize if it 11 was time sensitive. 12 Obviously, they needed to get the 13 information out to people before this meeting 14 when the post time was going to be. So, this 15 is just for information purposes that they are 16 going to race at 11:05 this Saturday. 17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 18 DR. LIGHTBAUM: And then the next 19 thing is just to -- We've published this on our 20 website but we've got the different times that 21 we're going to have the public hearings for the 22 different racing licenses. 23 Brockton and Middleborough is going

to be Wednesday, November 4 at 1:30 at the

1 conference center at Massasoit. Plainridge 2 Racecourse will be on November 4 at 10:00 a.m. 3 at the Plainville Council on Aging. And then Suffolk Downs will be on November 5 at 3:00 5 p.m. at the Boston Convention and Exhibition 6 Center. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is Commissioner 8 Cameron covering those? 9 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I certainly am, Mr. Chair. I believe Commissioner Stebbins 10 11 is joining me as well. 12 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I get to tag 13 along, absolutely. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Anything 15 else? That's just informational, right? 16 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else from 18 your side of the shop? 19 DR. LIGHTBAUM: No, that concludes 20 it. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very much. Now it is we have one item left which is 22 23 the fantasy sports conversation. I suspect 24 that will take a while. We could take a break

or we could plow through. I'm kind of leaning towards taking a break.

Food is pretty close, so let's try
to do it in half an hour. See if we get back
here at 1:00 or very shortly thereafter. So,
we will adjourn temporally until about 1:00 for
lunch. And we will then take up our fantasy
sports topic.

(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Ladies and gentlemen at about 1:10 we are reconvening the 167 meeting of the Mass. Gaming Commission at the Hynes.

We have one item left on our agenda again, which is a discussion about fantasy sports. Before we start this, I want to put a little context in this among other things, what we are and what we aren't doing. And what our role is and what our role is not.

We are not the decision-makers on any of the policy questions that might come -- might have to be resolved by policymakers.

That will be to some extent the Attorney

General, but fundamentally the Legislature and
the Governor.

We do however have an interest in the gaming world. And we do have a lot of experience in introducing a new gaming industry. And we have a lot of experience in the issues of whether and how to regulate, whether and how to license and so forth.

There's been some expressions of interest on the part of the Governor and the Legislature, the legistlative leadership, the speaker and the president in having us weigh in with whatever thoughts we might have, recommendations, suggestions. And we are more than happy to do that.

We have a modest legislative mandate to kind of keep an eye particularly on the electronic world in part to make sure that we continue to keep an eye out for the health of the lottery. So, we do have a mandate to kind of watch what is happening out there.

We also have some concern that our licensees, our casino licensees don't have the

playing field radically changed on them while they are in the midst of investing lots of money in a bricks and mortar casino. So, we have a number of interests here.

But the key point is to make sure that it's clear that we are not a decision-maker nor are we a regulator of fantasy sports at this point. At this point, there isn't one. And if there were to be one, whether and who would do it would be up to the Legislature and the Governor.

Commissioner McHugh within the last year, maybe even going further back has taken a particular interest in the evolving electronic Internet-based sports. At various times over the last year, year and a half different ones of them have been principally in the news.

There was a big who-ha about online poker. There's been lots of discussion about online games in general. There's been some discussion about online lottery games. At various times, different ones of them are the main topic of media discussion.

It happens that at the moment

2.1

fantasy sports is the main one. And we will 2 end up focusing on fantasy sports. But as far 3 back as a year ago Commissioner McHugh and I discussed his interest in sort of tracking all 5 of these new electronic Internet-based gaming 6 possibilities in order that we could be kept abreast. He was working on a memorandum, which 8 would kind of give an overall status report of all of these new industries before he left. 9 10 One of them is fantasy sports but only one. 11 So, I thought it was a good place to 12

start to have Commissioner McHugh kind of give an overview of the status of the Internet gaming world. Maybe give us a heads up about other things we're going to need to keep an eye on in the future. And then we'll pivot into a more detailed focus on the fantasy sports issues.

The memorandum that he will now talk about is in our folder, posted on the web in its entirety. Commissioner McHugh.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much. I'll be brief about this because the memorandum is in the

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

packet and is available online. And there are hyperlinks in it to the various sources, many of the sources on which I relied.

But I have been following this for several years and it is a rapidly evolving area. And that's why this memorandum that I wrote probably will be out of date in three or four days. But in any event, it's what things look like at least to me today.

And the basic background is that
Internet gambling is illegal in the United
States with a number of exceptions. The
default is that it is illegal, except for games
of skill and horse racing.

Throughout Europe, it is a very different picture. Internet gambling is heavily regulated, widely available in Europe. Illegal Internet gambling is widely available here. And so far as anyone can tell, it is here a big business. The fact that it is such a big business is one of the drivers toward a regulated market here in the United States.

Internet gambling is allowed in three states Nevada, Delaware and New Jersey

with respect to casino type games. Initially, before the games were rolled out there, there was concern about making sure that the players of these Internet games were --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Rather than have the memo on the web feed, which nobody is going to be able to read, why don't we have the Commissioners on the web feed. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Two of the big initial concerns as this was being rolled out was whether or not you can make sure and insure that the people playing the games were within the state boundaries where the games were being offered.

And whether you could assure that no underage players were playing. That has been largely so. The industry has largely solved that Internet gambling is up and running in Nevada and Delaware and New Jersey. And a geolocation mechanism has been created that assures that the players are within the state borders.

The identity protocols are significant and rigorous. Nobody can prevent

somebody who is overage from giving a credit

card or an account number to an underage

person. That's just impossible to prevent.

But by and large people are satisfied with that piece of it as well.

One of the problems to its implementation has been the reluctance of credit card companies for a variety of reasons spelled out in the memorandum to pay and process gambling charges even in the legal sites. But recently PayPal, which is a very big payer in Europe and a big payer in other spheres here in the United States, has begun testing payment protocols in New Jersey. That may well resolve the problem that the credit card concerns have created.

There basically are five different kinds of Internet gambling now. Casino-style gambling, social gambling, skill-based betting, which really isn't gambling, sports betting and fantasy, and I'll just touch briefly on each of those.

The casino-style gambling is prevalent in New Jersey. Basically, in New

Jersey you can go to a website hosted by a casino. And in New Jersey all of the licensees are casino operators. And you can find slot machines. You can find blackjack games. You can find poker games. You can find everything electronically that you could find in a casino.

In Delaware the same is true. New Jersey accounts for about 90 percent of the Internet gambling revenue in the United States for the moment. Delaware accounts for a very small amount of it. And in Nevada, there is only poker. Only poker is allowed.

Because there are so few players in Nevada and so few players in Delaware, Delaware and Nevada had entered into a compact that allows Delaware players to play poker in Nevada over the Internet and Nevada players to play poker in Delaware over the Internet.

In Massachusetts, there is no
Internet gambling. There are three bills in
the Legislature. One would allow if enacted
online lottery games. A second would allow
online -- what the bill says are online games
of skill including fantasy sports and poker.

And the third would allow casinos to operate online gambling under regulations the commission promulgates.

None of those bills has gotten out of committee at this point. Two of them -- Similar bills to two of them were in the Legislature last year and did not get enacted.

So, that's casino style money gambling. And you go to the sites. You put down money. You play the games. You get money or you lose money. And it's just like being in a casino itself.

A second type is social gaming. And social gaming takes the name that from initially at least the entry and the pathway to the social game was through Facebook. And much of the gaming play is an invitation to get your friends to play with you. You give information to the operator of the game. But now, there are social games that you can access from places other than Facebook.

And what differentiates the social game from the casino games I just described is that you play for play money. And you can't

take the money out of the game. In other words, you can't win money in the game and then use the money for goods and services or other tangibles outside the game itself.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You said you cannot.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: You cannot.

And typically, gambling is defined as a price for a chance for a prize. If you get all three of those together you've got gambling. If you take the prize away from it, which the social games do, you don't have gambling. You have a price for a chance but no tangible prize.

All of these games operate -- And there still notwithstanding the fact that you can go to them alone as standalones not through Facebook, there still are an enormous number of available games on Facebook. All you have to do is go to your homepage and click on the column on the left-hand side that says games. And there's an almost infinite number of offerings that will appear.

They operate, the vast majority of them do on a so-called freemium model, which is

that you go to the game and you get a certain amount of play money to start for free. You start off with some play money. And if you use up all of that play money, you can buy more for real money. And as a consequence across the globe, there are estimates that the social gaming of that type is a \$30 billion business today, which is astonishing. But there it is, those are the estimates.

A third category are games of skill.

And those aren't gambling, because you are actually playing a game that requires skill to play. Although there are elements of chance in the game inevitably, but skill predominates.

I listed in that memorandum a website called Skillz, not because I'm advocating or touting Skillz, S-K-I-L-L-Z, but because if you go there, you can see a true skill game. There's a bowling game there that depends on how you actually throw the ball down the lanes. It is for all intents and purposes a game of skill.

And you can bet in that game. You can find another player to play against. And

you can bet in that game against the other player. You both put in the same amount of money. And the winner gets the pot.

And there are other like games around. And you play that one on a tablet.

Others you can play on a desktop. But that one is a tablet-based game.

Then there is betting on horses.

And there's regular horse-race betting. There are a number of apps where you can sign up.

They all operate in a model called advanced deposit wager. You go to the website, you put some money in a pot. Then you bet out of that pot. Then if you win, the winnings are put into that pot. If you lose, the money is taken out of the pot, but the pot is there. So, you're not paying on each race as it occurs.

This is allowed under the same set of federal laws that allow off-track betting in other contexts and forums. And it is a vibrant live industry in which you can bet on horse races taking place anywhere in the world. You are not limited to a particular track.

Many of these sites allow you to bet

on races in England, the Middle East and other places, South America where horseraces are going. All in real-time, all with track odds and all for all intents and purposes as if you were there at the track except you are not.

Professional and college sports
betting, betting on professional and college
sports events is we know a large enterprise in
the United States. There are estimates of the
amount wagered but on the Internet, it's
illegal. There's a federal statute that bans
it.

It is legal in Nevada. There are Nevada bookmakers who are authorized. It is also legal in Delaware, because there was an exemption from the banning statute that carved out Delaware and Nevada because they allowed sports gambling at the time the statute was passed.

In Nevada, it works through bookmakers. You can go bet on the fortunes of the Red Sox, for example, if you want at the bookmaker there. In Delaware, it operates on a so-called parlay system. You have to bet on a

number of contests. And you bet on all of those contests in order to win the wager at all. So, it's not the same kind of individualized betting that occurs in Nevada.

And New Jersey currently has a lawsuit pending in an effort to have sports betting allowed in New Jersey and have the courts declare the federal statute that prohibits it unconstitutional.

They've lost at the federal district court level. They've lost at the panel level in the Court of Appeals which is the next step up. But the Third Circuit, which is the appellate court that governs that area has recently allowed a motion to have the case reheard by the entire court. And it is going to be very interesting to see what that court does when it does get to the new hearing.

As I said in the memorandum, lurking in the shadows sort of thus far but soon to emerge is something called E-Sports. That is a form of sports betting and sports play that has gained a huge audience but it's not a mainstream audience yet. That will change next

year.

The largest Internet purveyor of this kind of betting -- of this kind of sports activity is something called Twitch TV which is owned by Amazon. And they estimate and say that they are now broadcasting over the Internet 1.5 million Internet games each month to 100 million monthly viewers.

Basically, the way this works is you have two professional athletes, and there is a professional group of athletes who play these games. In fact, the State Department has authorized a professional sports visa for the players of these games. They play these games with illusory or imaginary — They are typical battle games or contest games, either people shooting guns at each other or armies of bizarre looking creatures attacking each other.

And two players, each has either a bunch of gunmen or has a bunch of these armies. And they attack each other. And somebody ultimately is standing at the end when all of the shooting is done. That person wins.

They distribute the games over the

Internet. You can tune in on any of these sites where these games are played. And you will hear play-by-play as the live play-by-play by a broadcaster and then a coed person. It's a replica of professional sports.

And there are also in countries and jurisdictions where it is legal betting opportunities. The odds keep changing as the betting keeps changing as the game progresses. You have not only a chance to bet but to improve your bet as things go forward.

That's where this is now. It's well-known to a demographic, I think, but not to mainstream yet. But that's going to change next year because Turner Broadcasting is going to have two 10-week tournaments in which a number of these professional athletes get together and do these battles.

And it will be like a pyramid, like a playoff. Then the last two will be standing on Fridays. And their battles will be broadcast on Turner TV live on Friday nights. So, you can tune into the Friday night battles on Turner Broadcasting each week.

And finally we have fantasy sports betting which is the topic we want to spend some time on today. Initially, fantasy sports started with rotisserie leagues, so-called rotisserie because it started in a restaurant called the Rotisserie.

It was season long activity in which you began at the beginning of a major league baseball or major league professional football season assembling a team of real players. And you played with that team throughout the season. You paid an entry fee to a league. You could trade players as you went along. You could change the team.

And at the end of the season, whoever had the best record with the fantasy team, and the best record was dependent on the actual performance of the various players on your team that person got all of the entry fees as a prize or at least a large percentage of them.

That's morphed now into the thing that we're most familiar with and has attracted the attention of all of us into daily fantasy

2.1

sports in which you assemble -- the process is essentially the same. You assemble a team, but the outcome of the game is based on how the team does in one or two days rather than over the course of the season.

And there are other approaches.

Indeed, if you go to the Red Sox website, you can go to the major league baseball site where there is a game called Beat the Streak in which you pick a player and if that player beats Joe DiMaggio's 56 game hitting streak, which I think was 1941, if that player beats that streak then you win the prize but you stay with that player all the time.

There are other variance not offered by major league baseball in which you can go and pick for example 57 players. And if they all get a hit on the same night, you win. You beat the streak and get whatever pot is there.

So, there's a lot of variety to the fantasy, the short-term fantasy world. The weekly prizes, the daily prizes are in the millions of dollars. It's big business. It's gotten a lot of publicity.

And that's what we are here to talk about today. But that's the context in which this occurs.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great. I feel like we have crammed for a test. Can I hold all of this in my head and remember it, but it's really helpful.

I think as we go through this process, I want to be mindful of the fact there will be other things. It sounds like this E-Sports thing will take off. Maybe we ought to be thinking about a template sort of for how we might suggest the Legislature consider all of these things as they start to come along.

So, let's turn our attention to the last thing on Commissioner McHugh's list, which is fantasy sports. Again, I just want to a set a little bit of a quick context.

I think that the decision-makers, policymakers about fantasy sports are basically going to have to decide four things. One is fantasy sports legal. The Attorney General is the chief law enforcement officer of the Commonwealth. She has already weighed in on

1 this issue.

She picked her words quite carefully, I think. She said something to the effect of, at least on first impression that she did not believe that the fantasy sports was in violation of any state or federal law.

That's not precisely the same as saying it's legal.

But she is the person who will make this decision at the outset. But she has gone onto say, I've noticed in the last day or two that really the question for the Legislature, and I think we agree with this is whatever the technicality of the law are at the moment, and we're going to talk about this in a minute, whatever they are whether it is technically legal or technically violates a law or not, the question really is should it be legal?

Do we want fantasy sports to be legal? The Attorney General I think has pretty much laid that out there. So, there's that threshold question. Should it be legal?

I think she would probably agree that whatever the Legislature decides, pro or

con that we would be well-served by some legislative intention to a statute that spoke to it directly, so we could understand clearly what is legal and what isn't legal.

In any case, we won't be talking other than for background information we won't be weighing in on whether or not it's legal.

But if it is legal, if the Commonwealth decides that it is legal and wants to move forward, then it has to decide should it be regulated.

There are all different kinds of regulation. You could have a regulation which is regulated by an entity such as the Gaming Commission. Or you could just have consumer protection laws like we have for lots of other consumer activities. Should it be regulated? That's a question I think we can offer some advice on.

The next question would be if it is regulated who should do the regulating? That's not for us to decide. That's for the Legislature to decide. And we won't be weighing in on that question.

The last question is if it should be

2.1

regulated what needs to be regulated? What
needs to be attended to? Do we look at this
through the same prism as we look through
casinos in terms of that kind of regulation?
Or is it a different kind of regulation? And
again I think our experience can be beneficial
in that thought process.

So, we'll primarily be focusing on the issue of should it be regulated? And if so what needs to be regulated, what issues, what critical variables need to be attended to by the Legislature in a regulatory environment.

So for starters, we asked a member of our legal staff to -- Catherine do you want to introduce Justin and his task?

MS. BLUE: Yes. For the

Commissioners and for our people watching us
online, Justin Stempeck is an attorney in our
legal department. I asked Justin to take a
look at the concept of fantasy sports. He has
done an overview of both the law in

Massachusetts and then what's going on in other
jurisdictions.

So, he's happy to answer any

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

questions or present on anything you would like him to discuss. His memo is in the packet as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thanks. Justin?

MR. STEMPECK: Good afternoon, Mr.

Chairman, Commissioners. As Catherine
explained, the memo I put together essentially
it's a survey of looking at the history in

Massachusetts of gaming law both statutory and
in case law to see how the framework evolved,
what it applies to, what it doesn't apply to.

And then also looking at some federal statutory
frameworks that are at issue and you've
probably seen referenced in the news as well as

And then also looking at a sampling of how some other states are addressing the situation be it through regulation like Nevada or through legislation like some other states or through some other mechanisms.

some you may not have seen.

Probably the best place to start is in the Commonwealth itself. Looking in the Commonwealth, really what I examined was the divide between what's called an illegal

2.1

lottery, which is the hazard of a wager based on chance to win a prize, as Commissioner McHugh mentioned.

That I think is important to know is not just a lottery as a normal person may think of it where you buy a lottery ticket, you have a chance to win something. Lottery has been broadly applied in a whole range of games that I go through in the case law that I cite there, but where the court analyzes whether there's a predominance of skill versus chance in a particular situation. That's always been a question of fact.

The courts look at a variety of different factors to render their conclusions. So, those factors have ranged in the various case they've looked at.

The other sort of half of the analysis is looking at there's some statutory framework in Massachusetts that addresses betting pools and registration of bets. Those statutes are interesting in that they criminalize a lot of the behavior associated with running these registration -- these bet

registration services or these betting pools.

But there's sort of a gap in the explanation of exactly -- statutory definition of say a bet. The case law defines a bet.

There's case law that is good in Massachusetts that's fairly old but it's been repeated as recently as 1992, which talks about a bet as risking money upon an incident where one or both parties could lose by chance. There's an uncertain outcome. So, that says that's a bet.

And there's cases that say that.

So, you have to look in those two lenses, the lens of illegal lottery, the lens of whether there's sports pools and some sort of registration of bets in a given contest and look at those. That's sort of a question I would say that perhaps falls outside the Gaming Commission simply that's for the decision—makers, as you mentioned Mr. Crosby.

That's a statutory interpretation question. It may be an analysis of the case lawtype of question. So, there's not a lot of law in Massachusetts that goes through that betting definition framework, but there is

some. And it's important to look at that. And that has some definitions therein.

Beyond the sort of divide between the betting pools and the illegal lotteries in Massachusetts, we have to be aware of the federal framework here. Probably the most commonly cited statute as it applies to daily fantasy is UIGEA which is on the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act, which was a federal statute passed in 2006, which really was a statute that addressed financial transactions.

It was prohibiting financial transactions between gambling institutions and banks and credit card companies. And that statute has been referenced thousands of times in recent articles.

But the statute itself at the very beginning it says there's a rule of construction. And the rule of construction explains that this particular statute is not meant to abrogate or interfere with any state law that addresses the same topic or any federal law that addresses the same topic.

So, it's a very narrow scope when you look at UIGEA. UIGEA has what has been cited many times a carveout for fantasy sports. And the carveout exists in the definition of a bet or wager under UIGEA. I cite it in my memorandum, but you'll see it has certain criteria you have to meet in order to qualify as a fantasy sport under UIGEA in which case UIGEA does not apply to you.

So, it's a narrow statute that I think some sources may have misinterpreted and broadly used and perhaps unintentionally as being the sort of rubber stamp of approval, but not necessarily.

There are other statutes that are federal that are worth looking at as well.

There is the Illegal Gambling Enforcement Act, which is often called IGBA which talks about federal enforcement of illegal gaming.

It's predicated upon a violation under state law of a gambling statute. So, there's a lot of things that happen. If a state law on gambling is found to be triggered, then that can in turn trigger a variety of

different federal statutes, which I discuss in the memorandum.

So, there's a lot of concerns here to thing about when you are looking at the various cases, the various statutory frameworks as to if it's determined under one rubric to qualify as a particular outcome, does that trigger further repercussions in other statutory frameworks or in some other context.

So, it's not just an easy decision you say yes or no. There's a lot of nuance to this that will trickle down upon a rendering of decision one way or the other by the powers that be.

So, I'm happy to go into detail about anything else you may have questions about, but the memorandum is in the Commission packet.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Two points
that I drew from your very thoughtful and
thorough memorandum, were (1) that it's really
hard to figure out where in the scheme of
Massachusetts and federal law this fits. And
by this I mean fantasy sports in terms of its

2.1

permissibility and impermissibility. Am I right in that?

MR. STEMPECK: Yes. That's correct, Commissioner McHugh. It hasn't been addressed. It's a relatively new field. It has not been specifically addressed in Massachusetts. And trying to find a parallel in the history of Massachusetts jurisprudence is not easy to do because nothing really matches this footprint.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So, you can make arguments that it does. You can make arguments that it doesn't.

MR. STEMPECK: That's exactly right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Which is my suggestion in the long run is rather than debate whether it is or isn't, the Legislature will probably need to step up and make a statement as to whether it wants to be or not.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. And a second point that I drew from your memorandum is that this UIGEA carveout as you've talked about, this exception to the UIGEA law basically says that certain transactions, monetary transactions between a bank and

2.1

another entity, a financial transaction is 2 prohibited under certain circumstances but those certain circumstances don't exist if 3 we're talking about fantasy sports as that is 5 defined in the statute. It doesn't do anything 6 more than say that fantasy sports are not subject to this federal law dealing with 8 particular kinds of monetary transactions. 9 MR. STEMPECK: That's right.

MR. STEMPECK: That's right. The carveout essentially is activity or to qualify as fantasy sports under the carveout of UIGEA that particular operation will be exempt from UIGEA but it doesn't speak to other state law, other federal law.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. So, that is two lays of the land. Now I think --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I did have a question on your memo. There's the statute 271 section 16(A) that talks about betting pools. You just mention this very briefly. It does prohibit the legal registration of buying or selling of pools upon the results of a trial or contest of skill.

Maybe this hasn't been tested at the

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

state level, but is this something that could apply here?

MR. STEMPECK: I think it could have the potential to apply under certain circumstances. There's one case that talks about what a betting pool is. And it discusses it as a combination of stakes out of which the money for the winner is derived with the operator of that particular pool taking some percentage.

So, there's one case that discusses it. It's an older case, but this particular statute, it has, as you can see, fairly archaic language. And it hasn't really been tested in a modern context to see its applicability under something like daily fantasy sports.

But I agree that that's some curious language there when it is talking about the wagering or registering of bets on a contest of skill, which is kind of the hot button word now, skill versus chance. So, I think it bears certainly additional investigation.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Principally on the questions now is the time we start thinking

about, should this be regulated and if so what should be regulated? I hope at the end of the day we will sort of come up with a plan of attack, how we are going to try to get our arms around all of these issues and when we might be able to get back to the Legislature.

I know Commissioner Cameron has been at an international conference recently which was explosive with information and discussion about fantasy sports. And I think she's got a lot of stuff to say.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, that's true Mr. Chair. First of all, I want to thank Commissioner McHugh. This was very thoughtful. It's really important that we as a Commission keep up with all of the latest trends, because we don't know when and what will be available here in the Commonwealth in the future. And for us to have a working knowledge and understanding is really important for us I think.

Timely conference the week before last, International Gaming Regulators conference in which fantasy was a prominent

2.1

topic. Regulators from around the world, a presentation on fantasy from a technical perspective and lots of legal questions as well. I have to say the consensus from regulators around the world is that it should be regulated.

Lots of discussion and one regulator after another saw issues and said hey, this needs to be regulated. So, it was timely for me to be there.

And I would just like to talk about some of the concerns that were brought up at the conference and then a couple of follow-up conference calls afterwards to flesh out some of the issues.

But I think the first issue is the credibility and the integrity of fantasy sports. I think that was a concern, an overwhelming concern with people, regulators as well as those who have some technical expertise.

And the player fairness, if you get in early do you have a better deal than if you bet later. Again, these are just concerns.

They haven't been fleshed out. Everybody was asking questions and trying to get a handle on this. Group play, the policy questions about that. Computer playing against an individual, commonly referred to as bots.

Scripting programs, computer aided mathematical analysis like a decision tree to help you decide how your wager is going to go, what team you pick. The game fairness itself, is everything available to everyone.

Group play, five people in one location, a collusion issue. Can a system be hacked? Can the account be altered? Can the outcome be altered? Can you change your lineup after you submitted it? These are all questions that were debated, and I think lent itself to asking these questions.

Insider information, that lends itself -- We are talking about a lack of transparency of information here. Questions about licensing and background checks. No outside auditors involved.

You can't meet the winner. It's a screen name. Descriptions of fantasy where

Internet game with a mix of skill and chance.

So, the talk about all skill, there was no

consensus on that that's for sure.

Where is the money coming from?

Where is the money going? Are there separate player accounts from balance sheets? AML and money-laundering discussed, a huge issue.

There are no safeguards for that right now as there is with other forms of gaming. We know how hard we've worked as a Commission to look at that issue and make sure our licensees have the proper policies in place there.

Responsible gaming is another huge piece of this. The National Center for Problem Gaming has just issued a position paper here with fantasy sports. And they had a number of concerns. They mentioned that the demographics of fantasy sports participants, predominately young male enthusiasts, high risk for gambling addiction, in their opinion. They are preoccupied, unable to stick to limits of time and money.

They talk about the difference in fantasy sports how it has evolved. And

traditionally, as Commissioner McHugh pointed
out, it was long-term kinds of things. You'd
play for a whole season. There was less risk.

But now the contests are faster and they
believe that there is more -- a higher risk to
developing a gambling problem. So, certainly
they are advocating some kind of regulation
with regard to fantasy sports.

Some of the legal concerns

discussed. Again, we get back to consumer

protection. But inside the game what is the

winning percentage? Is there a limit on

entries? Is there a legal recourse for the

consumers? Again, a transparency issue. What

are the conditions of the contest? There is a

lack of disclosure on winnings.

Unregulated advertising, and one of the attorneys said that Massachusetts residents are the greatest participants in fantasy sports. Now I haven't verified that but I was provided with that information. So, it is certainly something for that reason we should be looking at.

I am speaking for one Commissioner,

but I certainly was convinced that this is an 2 area which should be regulated. I might have a 3 little bit of a unique perspective. I have always been very interested in sports betting. 5 I spent a good deal of my career in 6 New Jersey dealing with illegal sports betting. I have seen the harm. I am in no way comparing 8 fantasy to illegal activities around sports 9 betting in other locations other than when an 10 industry goes unchecked. There are real 11 possibilities for things to happen that 12 certainly we would want to protect the 13 consumer. 14 I know there's one league for 15 example that their players can play. That's at least an issue --16 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Professional 18 league where they can play? 19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, one 20 There's a limit on how much, but I 21 just think in the least that is a perception 22 issue. So, just a lot of issues to think 23 about, a lot of opportunity for individuals to 24 (A) have a problem with this and (B) not have

the right protections in place in this
industry.

So, I certainly came away thinking that there are issues here. And I as one Commissioner think there is a need to regulate this industry.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, I do
too. I want to draw a parallel or talk about
the similarities of daily fantasy with other
forms of gambling that are widely recognized as
gambling. And I know there's distinctions, but
in the case of poker, everybody knows that
there's skill involved. There's many forms of
skill.

You can be a good reader of telltales, other signs or you could be a good bluffer. You could do good odds, counting cards or whatever it may be. There's an element of chance, obviously because you get your hand dealt and you don't control that. But the skill comes after that element of chance is introduced. And the performance of the cards is fixed. An ace is always going to

beat a king and so on.

In the world of fantasy sports I would argue it's reversed. The skill comes in first where you pick the players. And the chance comes in later when the players perform well or not so well. And there an added version of variability here just in the sheer numbers of combinations that any one person can play, can choose by having 10 picks from a large number of players.

I did a quick calculation. And if you have 10 picks of a large pool of people in fantasy sports, you would have 10 factorial number of probabilities or rather combinations. One of them is likely to be the winner against somebody else.

There is also elements of I don't know the hand of my competitor. I don't even know who that competitor is in the world of fantasy. But you are indeed competing against that person or many others that you may not know.

And I think there's also other similarities to other games. There's an

element of pari-mutuel at play here at least in some contests. So, that would fall under the racehorse arena. There's elements of sports betting, etc.

And I know we're not trying to answer the question of the legality here, but I think there's enough similarities to other forms of gambling that have been widely accepted as gambling that it merits the regulation that Commissioner Cameron and everybody seems to be coalescing around. don't know why with those similarities we would treat an 18-year-old and a 21-year-old differently. The fantasy sports for example currently allow 18-year-olds to play in their sites. They also are allowed to do transactions with credit cards, which we thoughtfully went through a very long process of understanding and regulating. And there is no credit card at the casino or the lottery here in Massachusetts.

Why would it be different, and I'm just asking a rhetorical question, why is it now accepted simply because there is some

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

carveout or some lack of definition if the activity can be replicated just as much.

If you pay fantasy for a whole season that may be a different story. But you can play every day that may change the equation.

So, the responsible gaming issues, the credit is another area that I think are to be looked at. I also know or happen to be thinking about there is somebody drawing a line just like in the sports book. Somebody is saying and making a judgment call that Tom Brady is going to be worth more than Tony Romo or whatever the case may be.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's clear.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Or Peyton Manning
or Drew Brees.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That Tom Brady is going to be at the top, but even Tom Brady has a bad day every once in a while, by the way. And there is that element of chance that I was talking about earlier.

And you just mentioned this very quickly Commissioner, but if that line

progresses over time, you are either coalescing
around sports booking or coalescing around
pari-mutuel betting, in my opinion. And if
that line is not visible to the participants,
there may be a real question of consumer
protection there, in my opinion.

I don't know if it is or isn't, but that was allegedly what gave trigger to this investigation by the FBI relative to the allegation of insider trading. If the people making the lines are also able to gamble elsewhere, then maybe the game is not really as fair as one might seem.

And I think it all goes back to the question of fairness, which was the first point you made. For the participants to continue to engage, which I think is something that the industry would be very interested in, they have to be perceived as being fair. And I think there would be a case for disclosure, regulations for example just like there is in the world of finance to ensure the public confidence in the process that at a minimum would be a starter for all participants.

So, I for one think that there is a big business case, if you will, for regulation.

I know that there are other questions to answer, but that's a big issue in my opinion.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I would just like to jump in on the fairness piece here. If you think about it, as we all have, all of our gambling regulations and they are now hundreds of pages long, are designed to protect basically two interests, maybe three, the integrity and fairness of the play that's offered to the bettor, the consumer, to ensure that the game, the dice game, the card game is what it purports to be.

And a second major interest is to protect the revenue stream and the taxes and the investments that the Commonwealth is getting. And together they promote consumer confidence which is a third interest. And the consumer confidence in turn will get people to continue to play the game.

And so far the tax piece is not present in the fantasy world but the consumer protection interests that underlie most of the

gaming regulation are. And it extends well beyond the credit, the collection practices and the like.

It's everything that is built into the regulations as to how the game is run. The fact that you can't change the dice. The fact that only one person can touch the dice. The fact that you have to call out when the bets are over. And this highly prescriptive atmosphere and machine that we've created is designed to ensure that the thing is what it purports to be, and that people can have confidence that somebody is watching to ensure that the thing is what it purports to be.

And it seems to me that any transaction or any form or any vehicle by which lots of money can be transferred from one person to another needs that kind of oversight from an exterior source to ensure that the conditions under which that money is being transferred from one to another are conditions

(A) that everybody knows about and (B) that are in fact observed.

So, it seems to me that this is when

2.1

you get to that level no different from the 2 Commodities Futures Trading Commission, the New 3 York Stock Exchange rules, the SEC rules. All of this is designed to do the same thing at 5 And just need to have somebody bottom. 6 watching carefully when big sums of money are being transferred from one person to another in 8 other than a purely private transaction. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner 10 Stebbins, did you want to weigh in? 11 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Sure. Τ 12 don't want to go through and echo everything 13 that my colleagues have said. For the most 14 part, I generally agree with the comments that 15 you've touched upon. 16 I think for me there are three areas 17 of concern, interest that I have, much of those 18 have been touched upon already. I am a former 19 rotisserie guy. To show you how long ago I 20 played, they would mail us the results every 21 week. So, this certainly wasn't anything as 22 tech savvy as it is today. And I usually 23 drafted guys who were already on the DL, just 24 to show you how good I was.

I think what's been interesting is a lot of the developments that have taken place in the last few weeks is that there has been statements from within the industry talking about protecting the integrity of the game, the integrity of their devices. That is obviously a similar comment we hear as we approached introducing expanded gaming in the Commonwealth.

I followed the developments of the industry saying there is certainly room for us to self-monitor ourselves. I worked for a manufacturing association. I think there would have been a lot of people concerned if we all decided to monitor ourselves on behalf of all manufacturers.

Some of the other areas that interest me, Commissioner Cameron laid a lot of them out. But some of the basic just going through one of the websites that's been discussed, my concern was not really identifying or finding a complaint process.

If you go down to Plainridge right now and start to play one of our machines,

there's somebody you can call upon to contest
the results of the machine. They can pull the
device out of the machine. You can call a
gaming agent to come over and talk to them.
They can go back and reveal surveillance
footage.

And one of these sites even said that one of the principles for agreeing to play is that you will not be allowed to participate in a class-action lawsuit. So, there are some pieces of it there that are being taken away that I didn't see protected an individual from at least being able to raise a complaint with one of the sites they are playing on.

I guess the third thing I want to touch on is as we go through this thoughtful conversation about regulation, and Commissioner McHugh's memo laid it out pretty specifically, the interesting elements as we move into a new age with the Internet piece of gaming on the horizon, that we are thoughtful and considerate that things that we talk about, I think we also need to consider in the broader picture of the future trends of Internet gaming.

How are bricks and mortar facilities may use pieces of Internet-based gaming to advance their business interest as well.

With that being said, I certainly think we need to move the conversation ahead, move the discussion ahead, perhaps bring in some subject matter experts on the technology side of this who can help us give additional guidance and further our conversation around potential regulations.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You know I think that is key. Something that I was thinking about as Commissioner McHugh was going through his overview of the Internet gaming developments that could very well be stale very soon.

What the approach of each of these states is to their view -- We're thinking about our own state of course. -- our view of these particular case may open the door to a number of games that we don't know of. The notion about what's in the future, what's the next version.

If the platform is the Internet and

technology and the speed at which things get developed and we simply see this as well, we are calling it skill so we are okay. That may mean a number of things in the very near future that we just may not be prepared to deal with just because of the way that technology and all these games evolve.

So, having that thoughtful process I think, maybe engaging other parties. I was thinking we would probably put some talking points, a memo, maybe like what we did with our prior white paper relative to the tax law as it applied to the Gaming Act, and for the purposes of ensuring some robustness to the gaming industry maybe there is something that we can put together to advance that conversation and inform policymakers as to what the decision points may be.

One of which is there is a big unknown here depending on how even something as simple as the definition of bet is looked at, whether by a court or by others.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think it's clear, certainly the consensus here and it's

commonsensical I think that there needs to be some degree of regulation of this phenomenon, but there already is.

We have consumer protection laws on the books, which would relate to this of some sorts. And there are lots of transactions. I think of used car salesmen. We regulate used cars. We have a Lemon Law. Then the Attorney General has a whole range of laws that she can use to oversee a number of transactions.

We don't necessarily set up a regulatory body for every industry that needs to be regulated. We come at this from the standpoint of the casino industry, which is the most heavily regulated industry on earth in a way that I think all of us think maybe is a little much.

And I think -- I don't have an answer to this, but I think we need to think about this industry and try to get some kind of a philosophic frame on it. Why does it require what level of regulation? Does it require an agency or does it just require some new consumer protection laws?

The casino industry is a cash
business, which is an extraordinary,
extraordinary phenomenon as we now are
beginning to see ourselves. And it's an
industry with roots in as we know organized
crime and has a terrible history.

This is neither one of those. So
just think we need to think carefully about

just think we need to think carefully about what is the appropriate level and structure.

There has got to be something of the kinds of things we've already talked about.

But I wonder whether Justin,

Catherine, Paul Connelly, who is going to help

us on sort of the broad policy side of this

might think a little bit about whether there is

a way, is there a mechanism for saying this is

why this particular industry deserves this

level of regulation.

Why is this different from the casinos or is it? Why this different from car sales or is it? What are the variables that make this subject to whatever level of regulation? So, that's one thing. I think we need to try to be really thoughtful and

2.1

intentional about that.

Should the operators be licensed?

That's really interesting. It's at the heart of where we are in our industry again for understandable reasons in the past. But I think again we need to kind of think about why do we license. We don't license everybody who does business. We do make them do certain things, but if you want to come in and open a grocery store -- Again, why do we require some people to be licensed?

Why do we require the casino operator to go through the incredible suitability checks that we put them through? And do those same criteria apply here? I don't know whether they do or don't, but there needs to be some contextual framework that gives reason to where we propose coming down on this.

The idea of outside experts now beginning to think about how we go forward here, I want to be very careful that we don't cut the grass of the Legislature. They will be having hearings. They will be having people come in and talk about stuff.

But I think if we were to use some outside help in helping us frame these questions, what issues might the Legislature want to look into? What might be a philosophic structure of regulation? Why might we recommend that this be heavily regulated or less heavily regulated?

and maybe the industry too. They have a right,

I think, to weigh in on these kinds of
questions. I know there are people from the
industry here. I would welcome their
contribution to helping us figure out what are
the questions that we might want to give the
Legislature to ask. We're not going to give
them answers.

We have to keep in the backs of our minds we do have one fiduciary obligation to the casino industry. And we have been very firm that we believe that it would not be fair to change the rules of the road, to change the competitive environment radically without the bricks and mortar folks at least being at the table. And I think we do have an obligation to

think about that. And that should be in the backs of our minds.

The issue of taxes, as Governor

Baker said there are already taxes applied here
on profits if and when there ever are profits
in this industry. There are taxes applied to
winnings, as we are very familiar. Should
there be more? I don't know.

I do think we want to be mindful of the fact that if we came in heavy on this, you can crush an industry like this overnight.

There is some misimpression that people are making money hand over fist. As I understand it, nobody's making money in this business yet.

They're operating at a huge burn rate with borrowed money or raised money. We don't want to kibosh that industry unless we decide we want to kibosh that industry. We don't want to do it by accident.

So, those are some of the things that I think. And hearing the kinds of issues that they raised in conferences, this kind of issues you raised are great. And that's why I think we can be really constructive and say to

the Legislature if you do look into this these are the kinds of things we want to consider.

But I would like to get that overarching kind of approach as well.

Commissioner Cameron, you're interested in following through on this I think. And Commissioner McHugh is too, but he is not going to be here. So, I think having you kind of be our point person if that works. But we will all be involved in this.

And I think the idea eventually would be to pull together a white paper, hopefully pretty quickly because this is moving pretty fast. The industry absolutely has to know what the rules of the road are so it can get its act together. That we could address these issues at least do we think it should be regulated if so why and what. Maybe we can begin to outline something like that over the next relatively very few number of weeks.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And in doing so, we talked a lot about those aspects. They cannot be simply the question of the legal framework even though that's a key one. But

2.1

the business model has to be examined. 2 What are the operations really, what 3 is that algorithm at least in general terms? 4 Understand how people -- How does that 5 calculation take place, and how are the 6 winnings determined? CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is 8 interesting. This might be one where you could 9 sort of take point because this is an area that 10 you understand and are particularly interested 11 in. And I'm I just winging it here. Please 12 agree or disagree, but I would think maybe it 13 would be of interest to you if somebody from 14 industry or more than one were willing to come 15 in and talk about the business model to help us 16 understand. 17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think that's 18 key. 19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mr. Chair, we 20 have been on a couple of conference calls. We 21 tried to educate ourselves. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You and Enrique? 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes. 24 another one with Commissioner Stebbins. So, we

are in the process of educating ourselves, speaking to experts. We are positioned to take these concerns that we brought forth verbally today and put them on paper with some meat.

I think the idea of just laying out the concerns is an approach. Sharing it with the Attorney General's office. We've already had conversations with them about this. I know they're looking at a lot of legal issues. So, sharing this information, bringing these concerns forward I think is appropriate.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The Attorney

General considers this important enough that

she has dispatched her General Counsel Richard

Johnston to join us all day long. Thank you

for coming to join us.

I think that would be a really interesting thing to pursue. Any other thoughts sort of preliminary either about things you might want to consider, how to approach it?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, I think there will be other things to consider but I think we will have some sessions with experts.

We'll bring them in. They've already volunteered to come in and talk to us about these issues.

And we will just work through it, figure out what we want to put down and have a draft to present and see what further work is needed.

So, I think the first step is to bring some folks together in talking about what's important and what the concerns are and laying them out there.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay, great. I don't think we need any votes or anything. I think we are ready to go on this one.

We do have one other issue, I am sorry to say. As everybody in the room knows this is Commissioner McHugh's last day. I'm happy report that we have had two extraordinary Gaming Commission celebrations of Commissioner McHugh's contributions.

We had a party where one of our state troopers has a rock band and he and his band came and played. And there were a number of testimonies. We had a staff meeting. At

2.1

the end of the staff meeting, there were a number more.

Commissioner McHugh has made me promise that we won't go back and do any of that again. I guess I'll keep my promise.

But the Attorney General has asked for an opportunity to be heard before

Commissioner McHugh leaves. I think Richard

Johnston is here on her behalf.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes. Chairman

Crosby, I've been dispatched here for two
reasons. One was to listen to this excellent
presentation on fantasy sports and one to bring
the Attorney General's comments about

Commissioner McHugh. She unfortunately
couldn't be here because she's traveling on AG
business out of state but she did ask me to
read a statement on behalf of Commissioner

McHugh, which I will do.

I want to thank Judge McHugh for his years of service on the Gaming Commission and for his commitment to public service. As one of the initial Commissioners, Judge McHugh helped shape the policies and procedures by

which the Commission has functioned. He brought his judicial insight to bear on the many legal issues that have arisen with this new industry.

During more than his quarter century serving on the bench, Judge McHugh presided over many significant matters and his tireless work led to important reforms that ensure a more equal access to justice for all Massachusetts residents.

Judge McHugh will leave a lasting impact on the legal profession, those of us in public service and the people of the Commonwealth. We thank Judge McHugh for his significant contributions and wish him all the best in his well-deserved retirement.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Here, here.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you very much. Please convey my thanks to the General for that very generous notice.

I want to say just a couple of words here. We did have an overwhelming sendoff last week, two indeed. But I wanted to say publicly that this has been an incredibly rewarding

2.1

1 journey.

We came together three and half
years ago, a little bit more than three and a
half years ago now, seven people, the five of
us sitting here, Janice Reilly and Jamie Ennis.
We moved into a big empty room at 84 State
Street and couldn't figure out for the first
couple weeks how we're going to fill it up.

We didn't know each other. Steve and I had worked, Chairman Crosby and I had worked together before. So, we knew each other professionally, but we didn't really know each other well. One of the many thoughtful things the Legislature did when they put this statute together was place requirements on the backgrounds of the Commissioners so that we got an array of backgrounds, an array of outlooks, an array of experiences to bring to bear on this new and important industry.

Bruce came from the manufacturing world. He had been a White House fellow, the business world knew that world, was familiar with it, was comfortable with it.

Enrique came from the business, an

MBA, served on two really important financing boards, had been in government, had been in government finance. Gayle had started out patrolling the New Jersey Turnpike by herself at night, wound up second-in-command at the state police in New Jersey. Steve, an entrepreneur, government service, educator.

And I came from a legal background.

And we through a lot of really hard work got to know each other really well and to trust each other really well. And to think through the complex problems with which we were faced. And to try to build because we all had the same ultimate outcome, to try to build a first-class public agency.

When I was first interviewed and I was asked why I wanted to do this, I said that that was the reason. It's a new industry. I thought the public should be protected, but above all I thought it was an enormously challenging opportunity to build a first-class public agency. Very few people are given that opportunity. And that's what the challenge, I thought, this job entailed.

And as I look now back across those three and a half years and think about the team we have assembled -- I want you to understand who they are. So, I'm going to just say one word about each of the leaders of the dream team. Our HR Director is Trupti Banda, more than 13 years of HR leadership in the public and private sector. Catherine Blue, our General Counsel who is here today, more than 30 years' experience including General Counsel in large public agencies and in the private sector.

Paul Connelly who is also here today, our Director of Licensing who was active and had an important role in public safety in the Department of Homeland Security, technology in the private sector.

Elaine Driscoll, our Public

Information Officer who has been a public

information officer in Los Angeles and New York

and for the Boston Police Department here, all

high visibility, high tension organizations who

has been invaluable to us as we've moved along.

John Glennon, our Chief Information

1 Officer, over 30 years of information 2 technology leadership in the public and private 3 sectors. Jill Griffin, our Workforce, Supplier and Diversity Development Director, 15 years' 5 experience and served as a senior director of programs at the Boston Foundation. Derek 6 Lennon our CFAO who has done financial work on 8 the legislative committees up on the hill and 9 was the CFO for the Department of Conservation and Recreation. 10

Alex Lightbaum, our Director of
Racing, who is here today, 26 years of
experience in the racing area, a veterinarian,
well-respected in that industry. Janice Reilly
who has been with Steve forever and who has
held many important positions who is our Chief
of Staff. Mark Vander Linden who is the head
of our responsible gaming, who has been the
executive officer in the Office Problem
Gambling, Treatment and Prevention at the Iowa
Department of Public Health.

Karen Wells who is here today, our Director of the Investigations and Enforcement Bureau, most recently served as Undersecretary

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

for Law-Enforcement at the Massachusetts

Executive Office of Public Safety. Assisted by

Bruce Band who had an enormous important role

in New Jersey gaming regulation and by Loretta

Lillios who served with distinction in the

Middlesex County DA's office, in the AG's

office.

John Ziemba, our ombudsman who is present at every meeting and who was cochair of the government practice, the section of one of the area's major law firm and served as acting Secretary of Transportation. And our state police unit headed by Detective Lieutenant Brian Connors who is at the rear of the room. That is I submit to you unmatched by any state police unit in the Commonwealth and is filled with people who not only are outstanding law enforcement officers but outstanding people as well.

That is an A Team. And it is at this point, a great source of pride to me that we were be able to put together a group of that caliber of that quality to carry forward the work of this Commission and protecting the

interests of the citizens of the Commonwealth. 2 We're at an important point now in 3 the evolution of the Commission. We are about to get a new Executive Director. We are about 5 to get a new Commissioner to replace me. And I 6 have every confidence in the Attorney General's thoughtful selection process that we'll have 8 somebody who will be able to move seamlessly 9 into the position that I've held. 10 But it's been a great journey. 11 There are some issues and things that we might 12 have done differently, but you can't sail 13 through uncharted seas without a few bumps 14 along the way. It's a terrific group and I am 15 really proud to have had the opportunity to 16 have worked with all of you. Thank you very 17 much. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you, 19 Commissioner. Do I have a motion to adjourn? COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So moved. 20 2.1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor, aye. 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

```
Page 178
                COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
 1
 2
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes
 3
     have it unanimously. Thank you all.
 4
 5
                 (Meeting adjourned at 2:27 p.m.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

## 1 ATTACHMENTS:

2

7

8

9

14

15

16

- Massachusetts Gaming Commission October
   29, 2015 Notice of Meeting and Agenda
- 5 2. Massachusetts Gaming Commission October 6 15, 2015 Meeting Minutes
  - 3. Region C Southeastern Massachusetts
    Estimated Category 1 (Resort Casino)
    Timeline with attachments
- 10 4. Wynn Everett October Presentation
- 5. MGM Springfield October 26, 2015 Letter to
  City of Springfield Regarding Design
  Changes
  - 6. October 27,2015 Letter Regarding
    Springfield MGM Casino Project with
    attachments
- 7. MGM Springfield October 15,2015 Notice of Project Change
- Massachusetts Gaming Commission October
   26, 2015 Memorandum Regarding
   Massachusetts Thoroughbred Breeders
   Association Request to Race at Finger
   Lakes Racecourse, New York with attachment

		Page 180
1	9.	Massachusetts Gaming Commission Division
2		of Racing October 21,2015 Letter Approving
3		Suffolk Downs Post Time Change
4	10.	Racing Division's Public Hearing Notice
5		Brockton Agricultural Society-Running
6		Horse Racing License Application
7	11.	Racing Division's Public Hearing Notice
8		Middleborough Agricultural Society-Running
9		Horse Racing License Application
10	12.	Racing Division's Public Hearing Notice
11		Plainridge Park Casino Harness Horse
12		Racing License Application
13	13.	Racing Division's Public Hearing Notice
14		Suffolk Downs-Running Horse Racing License
15		Application
16	14.	Massachusetts Gaming Commission Legal
17		Division October 23, 2015 Memorandum
18		Regarding Daily Fantasy Sports
19	15.	October 26, 2015 Commissioner McHugh
20		Memorandum Regarding Internet Gaming
21	16.	Email of Justin Evans Regarding Daily
22		Fantasy Sports
23		

Electronically signed by Laurie Jordan (201-084-588-3424)

Page 181 **GUEST SPEAKERS:** On behalf of Wynn MA, LLC Robert DeSalvio, Wynn Chris Gordon, Dirigo Group Rick Moore, City Point Partners Richard Johnston, Chief Legal Counsel, MA Attorney General's Office MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION STAFF: Catherine Blue, General Counsel Dr. Alex Lightbaum, Interim Director of Racing Jason Stempeck, Staff Attorney 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. 8 I, Laurie J. Jordan, further certify that the 9 foregoing is in compliance with the Administrative Office of the Trial Court 10 11 Directive on Transcript Format. 12 I, Laurie J. Jordan, further certify I neither 13 am counsel for, related to, nor employed by any 14 of the parties to the action in which this 15 hearing was taken and further that I am not 16 financially nor otherwise interested in the outcome of this action. 17 18 Proceedings recorded by Verbatim means, and 19 transcript produced from computer. 20 WITNESS MY HAND this 2nd day of November, 2.1 2015. 22 23 My Commission expires: LAURIE J. JORDAN

May 11, 2018

24

Notary Public