	Page 1
1	COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
2	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
3	PUBLIC MEETING #228
4	
5	
6	CHAIRMAN
7	Stephen P. Crosby
8	
9	COMMISSIONERS
LO	Lloyd Macdonald
L1	Gayle Cameron
L2	Bruce W. Stebbins
L3	Enrique Zuniga
L 4	
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	November 9, 2017 10;00 a.m.
L9	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
20	101 Federal Street, 12th Floor
21	Boston, Massachusetts 02110
22	
23	
24	

PROCEEDING

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are calling to order public meeting No. 228 of the Mass Gaming Commission on Thursday November 9th, 10:00 a.m. at our offices on Federal Street. First up, as usual, is the approval of the minutes, Commissioner MacDonald.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That I move that we approve the draft minutes as they appear on the packet of our meeting on October 26th of this year, subject to correction for typographical errors and other nonmaterial matters.

I will CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Comments? abstain from this, since I was not in attendance. Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I'll second the motion? Did someone second?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:

19 20

Page 3

1 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All opposed? The 5 ayes have it 4-0, Crosby abstains. Next up is 6 the administrative update from Mr. Bedrosian. 7 MR. BEDROSIAN: Good morning, I have three administrative 8 Commissioners. 9 updates. 10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 11 Good 12 morning. 13 MR. BEDROSIAN: The first is, I 14 think you might have seen Mr. Band's 15 announcement, that Sterl Carpenter will be 16 promoted to position of our regulatory 17 compliance manager. If you've ever worked 18 with Mr. Carpenter, you know he's a very 19 detail-oriented person, which is exactly what 20 we're looking for. He has a very good sense 21 of humor, also. We like -- we value that as 22 we go forward. So congratulations to him. 23 The second update is also good news. 24 Our licensing division issued a gaming school

certificate to the Massachusetts Casino Career Training Institute out in Springfield, so congratulations to them. I think they will be having some type of kick-off event in the future, which I imagine they'll invite the Commission to. As part of that, we also saw pictures of gaming equipment, including tables, literally going -- being hoisted up into their offices in Springfield. They had to take out windows to bring in the table games. So that's progress, so congratulations to them.

The last one is something that I think we've talked about at every meeting in the last couple months, which is the service employees. I am very happy to tell you something I think you already know, that lieutenant governor signed a supplemental budget, which included our language giving the Commission the discretion to exempt service employee's positions from the registration requirement that was currently in the Expanded Gaming Act.

So with that, we will obviously

Page 5

start working with our licensees, specifically MGM, and getting their recommendations for positions to be exempted, work with the IEB and come to the Commission.

And, also, I think there still needs -- I've talked to the Commission and staff about an educational component of letting people know what positions, what's required, the licensees need to work on, what their hiring requirements are.

So I think the timing is incredibly beneficial. We are very lucky to get it done now. Now we have the type to ramp up and give people the education and work with the Commission to make this as valuable as it can be.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: We had talked about that education piece, I think, back in the spring, when we were -- wanted to make sure that people weren't, kind of, self-selecting out of the process but had decided to put it on hold until, you know, this GSE issue got squared away. And now it

has. I'm glad to see we can, kind of, kick this off again, because still questions out there, as well as with respect to what our licensee's own hiring practices and processes are as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. And I have -- first of all, I agree. And thanks to the legislature for doing this. This was unusually quick for them and not easy to do, and it was great. And so, I'm glad you made a point of referring to it.

I've now spoken to the media a few times about it. And as you have pointed out, it isn't clear. People don't understand, not even the media really understands what happened. And I do think that the sooner that we can start talking about this, just to state it, what has been eliminated is what is, in effect, the automatic disqualification of people with felonies or many misdemeanors from being applicants for nongaming -- what we call gaming service employee jobs. There will -- we will -- we have the right to determine which categories of these nongaming employees

Page 7

will be exempt from the need to register and have, therefore, any background check, any CORI check done by us. But the employer remains, as any employer anywhere in Massachusetts, it has the right to do background checks, CORI checks, drug tests, whatever, and has the right to preclude people from working at positions where they think some kind of criminal record does have relevance to the job description. That's a right, which all employers have, and our licensees still have it.

What's gone is the broad-based automatic disqualification of anybody who is a nongaming service employee with these kinds of criminal records. No questions asked. Just gone -- just excluded. That's over. We have the ability to be much more nuanced about it, which is huge progress. But it's complicated. So I think the sooner we can get into this and make the rules flatout clearer, the better.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You know,
Mr. Chairman, I think that's a great summary.
In my opinion, it also bears mentioning that

2.1

-- that automatic disqualification wasn't really clear. There was ambiguity in the statute.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That we discussed here quite a bit. And brought, you know, the interpretation by some as a clear, automatic disqualification, but not necessarily by at least others, including me.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Including me, by we -- by the Commission.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But it's great that we have clarity, that the legislature listened to the need to clarify this issue, which is a very important aspect of the -- of the statute. And I just wanted to mention that.

right. But the Commission made the decision and it turned out to be a good decision, that it would be better to try to get the legislature to address this, rather than us wrestle with whether or not we could deal with it administratively. I was, frankly,

1 skeptical that it would work but it did.

And one other point I should make is that, community groups, both in Boston and in Springfield, really got behind this, got really organized, they coordinated back and forth across the state, which is relatively unusual, and worked in concert with local senators and reps, particularly Senator Lesser and Rep Wagner from -- who are the chairs of our committee and both from the Springfield area. But the community groups were really a critical part of this. And, in fact, in one of my updates I'll be talking a little bit more about that later on. Anything else on this topic?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Yeah. I'd like to give credit where credit is due. And that, once we as a Commission made the decision to proceed legislatively on this issue, as opposed to administratively on the issue, that -- that the person who -- who carried a ball up the field and was able to get legislation over the -- over the goal line was our chairman.

1 And that I don't know all the 2 details of it, but I do know enough that he 3 worked indefatigably with the senate and the 4 house leadership on this, and it's not 5 something that is simple. So I think that we 6 really ought to be grateful to the leadership 7 that our chairman had provided here. 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I agree. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. 10 a group effort. MR. BEDROSIAN: So I have -- one 11 12 last update, but it is a introduction of a new 13 employee in the IEB, which I will defer to Director Wells on. 14 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, before you 16 do that, there is also a new employee sitting 17 right behind you. 18 MR. BEDROSIAN: Oh. Well, yeah. 19 Shara is --20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: New capacity. 21 MR. BEDROSIAN: She's changed 22 capacities, that's for sure. She's moved up 23 from the IEB, which is a great move for the

legal department. And she's going to be the

Page 11

paralegal helping the legal department in many capacities. One of which is filling some big shoes, which I'm sure she can, being at these meetings helping us with our notes. So congratulations to her, also.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We've had much complaining from the 12th floor that the 13th floor stole somebody great from the 12th floor, our wing.

MS. WELLS: I can attest, she is great.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, right.
Okay. Madam Director.

MS. WELLS: Yeah. So just as a preliminary matter, I wanted to introduce Jonathan Millar, who is -- I want to publicly introduce, I know some here have already met him. But he is the new open-source specialist for the Investigations and Enforcement Bureau, which is a civilian position.

He comes to us -- he had originally been in Florida at the sheriff's department, and then at the probation department here in Massachusetts. He will be doing some

advanced, open-source and database searches, and will be tasked with really keeping current on the best practices and emerging technology in this field, which is, as you may be familiar with, very fast-moving and ever-changing. And then he will be also tasked with training the investigators, state police and, potentially, the financial investigators on some of these best practices in the new -- in this newer and emerging field. So I'd like to welcome him and just say hello.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Welcome.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Welcome.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Welcome.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah. I want to welcome -- welcome our new employee, as well and just -- I was very impressed with the credentials, frankly. Credit to the team for being able to recruit someone with tremendous credentials. And, also, I love the complement of sworn members of the IEB with civilian members. I think that's a really good start to that whole process. And it'll -- it'll

really help us in our efficiency with investigations and -- so I compliment the team for -- for thinking a little differently and bringing in someone of this quality to -- you know, to really add to our tremendous team.

MS. WELLS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I'd like to say one thing. Is that, I went down last week and introduced myself to Mr. Millar, and then asked him a rather fundamental question. What is open-source investigation anyway? And I can say that he was very articulate and patient with me, as he took me through the -- through the steps. And I think it's a very substantial enhancement to our capabilities.

MS. WELLS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

MS. WELLS: So as to the agenda item under the Investigation Enforcement Bureau, I have, for your consideration, the suitability of a qualifier for MGM Resorts International. That is Uri Clinton.

He was designated a qualifier in

Page 14

January, when he was promoted to the position of senior vice president and legal counsel. So MGM did a little bit of a reorg and they put him in between Seth Stratton and John McManus. So he is within that legal chain of supervision with respect to MGM Resorts International and the Springfield casino.

During the course of the investigation, his identity was confirmed. They also went through his employment. As I indicated, he is currently the senior vice president legal counsel, MGM Resorts International, where he was promoted in January of 2017.

He had started at MGM Resorts in

August of 2014 as a vice president and deputy
general counsel. Before that, from 2011 to

2014, he had been at Baha Mar Limited, where
he was a senior vice president, general
counsel, corporate secretary and chief
compliance officer.

From 2008 to 2011, he had been vice president general counsel, corporate secretary and chief compliance officer for Multimedia

2.1

Games, which is now Everi Games, which is one of our primary vendors and company that we license.

And prior to that, he had started his career in the gaming industry at Harrah's Entertainment, now Caesars Entertainment, in 2002, and worked there until 2008 as the vice president of legal affairs, the central division.

During the interview, he did explain his role at MGM Resorts International, specifically as it pertained to Massachusetts. He is in charge of the legal needs of each MGM property for the various regions, and the attorneys for the various MGM properties report to Mr. Clinton, as I explained is the case with Mr. Stratton. And from a day-to-day's perspective, he oversees and assists the regional attorneys with construction issues, regulatory issues, and operational and contract issues.

A second responsibility holds a setting government affairs strategies and addressing certain legislative issues and

2.1

concerns from the various jurisdictions. He's also responsible for analyzing new legislative proposals and their potential impacts. He is also their lead attorney for MGM Resorts International development efforts.

He attended the University of
Las Vegas, where he attained a bachelor of
arts and political science in 1994, and then
attended Gon -- pardon me, Gonzaga University
School of Law in Washington, where he earned a
juris doctor in 1997. He then attended
Vanderbilt University, where he attained a MBA
degree in 2007.

As noted in his application, he had served as an officer for Multimedia Games.

And as such, Multimedia, as you're aware, is licensed in numerous jurisdictions, he had thought, approximately, 132, and he believed had been licensed, if not all of them, in many of those jurisdictions.

We queried, Louisiana, Mississippi, Indiana, California and confirmed his license status, that no derogatory information was noted by any of those jurisdictions who had

done suitability investigations, and the licenses were in good standing.

In conjunction with his current position, because he was promoted, he has also filed applications in New Jersey, Maryland and Michigan. But as yet, we seem to be the first one to license for suitability. But there was no identifiable derogatory information from either of those — any of those jurisdictions as well. He holds a license to practice law in Nevada and Tennessee, and his license is — his law license is in good standing in those jurisdictions.

In addition, the investigators looked at his involvement as directors in certain corporations, did a criminal check, civil litigations check, media coverage, and did a financial suitability analysis, all with positive results.

As a summary, no investigative issues were discovered which would disqualify him for any kind of finding of suitability by this Commission. And as such he demonstrated, by clear and convincing evidence, that he is

	rage 10
1	suitable for your vote of pardon me,
2	suitable for licensure as a qualifier for MGM
3	Resorts International. So my recommendation
4	is that I vote to find him suitable as a
5	qualifier, and we will enter that into the
6	record.
7	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion?
8	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I certainly
9	concur with the investigative recommendation
10	after reading the report. And I move that we
11	approve Mr. Clinton as senior vice
12	president
13	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Your speaker went
14	off.
15	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah. I
16	just I move that we approve Mr. Clinton as
17	a senior vice president for MGM.
18	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
19	COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second.
20	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any other
21	discussion? All in favor? Aye.
22	COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
23	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
24	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 3 have it unanimously. 4 MS. WELLS: Thank you. 5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Next up is 7 Ombudsman Ziemba, or his associate. 8 MR. DELANEY: Thank you, 9 Mr. Chairman. Yes, I'm filling in for John 10 today. So today we have for you the Wynn 11 Boston Harbor quarterly report for the quarter 12 ending September 30th of this year. 13 have with us today, from Wynn Boston Harbor, Jacqui Krum, senior vice president and general 14 15 counsel, and Peter Campot, director of 16 construction. And without further adieu, I 17 will turn it over to them for their quarterly 18 report presentation. 19 MS. KRUM: Hello there, everyone, 20 and thank you for having us. As you know, I'm 21 substituting for someone today, as well. Bob DeSalvio could not be with us this 22 23 morning, unfortunately, because he is at a

ribbon-cutting ceremony at the city of

Everett -- at the high school at the city of Everett.

So they're opening a new scholar athletes zone at the -- at the high school. And it's a pretty exciting joint venture between Suffolk, Wynn, the City of Everett, the mayor's office and the school district. So it's designed to promote academic coaching, mentoring health, wellness and postsecondary planning for high school students. So without further adieu, we'll take you through our quarterly report.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

MS. KRUM: So first thing is permitting. As you'll notice, over the last quarter our permitting was primarily almost exclusively due to the sediment. So we started dredging about 10 days ago. We have -- after obtaining our Chapter 91 license, our water quality certificate and our Army Corp. permit. And we are doing about 700 cubic yards a day. We've been doing it for about 10 days, and we're about 20-percent complete.

The goal is to be complete by

December 20th. And at that point we can start capping, because this is a dual -- it's not just a dredge, but we're also going to be capping the area as well. So we'll start capping in mid December. And that'll go until February 15th, when we run into the end of the migration period and have to stop activities

for the winter.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Jacqui,
quick question. How long did these permits
take? I mean, obviously, you received them
all. But kind of a general time frame for how
long they took to be approved.

MS. KRUM: It took us about seven months to get everything, which we were very pleased with the agencies and the responses we received. It was quite a good, efficient process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Could you say more about the -- or maybe Peter, about the parameters of the dredging; you know, what's being taken out, how much is being taken out; what's the objective here; what's the mandate?

1 MR. CAMPOT: Well, we're taking 2 out -- we're dredging about seven acres, about 3 75 percent of that is remedial. And in that 4 seven acres we're digging down about 2-1/2 5 feet and removing that. And then we'll 6 replace that with the same amount. I don't 7 remember the tonnage offhand, but we'll replace that with the same amount of clean 8 9 material. 10 The other 25 percent we're -- it's all navigational and we're removing down to 11 12 minus 15 so that we'll have -- at low water 13 we'll have 15 feet of depth. And we're over excavating so we're also bringing clean fill 14 15 back as part of that navigational dredge. 16 the intent to get all of that done by 17 March 1st of next year. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So 2-1/2 feet over 19 7 acres. 20 MS. KRUM: Right. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: WOW. 22 MS. KRUM: And we have a short video 23 to show you, it's about 45 seconds. 24

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, good.

1 2

MS. KRUM: And it shows you how the dredge process actually works. It's a very slow process. It's buckets by buckets.

4

3

(Video playing)

6

7

8

9

5

MS. KRUM: The first part there's no audio that's worth listening to so I'll talk over it. The first part was we removed -- there were four barges in this cove.

11

10

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Four barges?

1213

MS. KRUM: The video's a little off

There we

14

go. There were four barges in the cove that

center, you can't see the dredging.

15

we removed before the dredging could began.

16

And those had to been taken apart and removed.

17

They couldn't be towed out because they were

18

not in a sufficient condition to be removed

19

20

that way.

construction.

So you can see, they're dumping that

21

into a container there a barge, which gets

22

taken off site and treated, and then taken to

23

a landfill. I'll turn it over to Peter for

1

9 10 11

1213

1415

16

17 18

19

2021

22

23

24

MR. CAMPOT: Great. So first off, I'd like to say that we are on schedule for June 24, 2019 opening. I feel pretty good about the product right now. I want to say, before I go much further, that the construction managers, Suffolk, the trades, all of the workers are just doing a fantastic job. The cooperation from the labor unions has been terrific. The City of Everett has been great to work with. So it takes a lot of people to get a project of this size to where it is today, and we're in very good shape.

We have over a thousand workers on site right now. We're putting in place about \$2.5 million a day. We have 15 -- 15 months in and we got 20 months to go, 592 days but who's counting.

MS. KRUM: The little clock in our office counts down for us.

MR. CAMPOT: I have some images that I'll show you and then we'll get to some of the major milestones. So the first image you're seeing is where we were in August, three months ago, essentially. You can see to

the left, barely see the foundation to the convention center and now you can see, if you The other button. go to the next slide. She's an attorney, she can't help it. Right there. You can see that that convention center's completely framed out. We had a topping-off ceremony of the completion of the podium, which is over a million square feet of structural steel. And that is all in place. And the remainder of the structural steel and minor details is scheduled to happen over the next several weeks. And we'll be placing, weather-permitting, all of the remainder of the concrete metal on metal decks between now and December 15th, which puts us in great shape for the winter. Go to the next slide.

Here's a view from the water. We're up at the 12th floor of the tower. And I think the next slide shows where we were in August. That's the third floor. And then, if you -- the next slide we're currently on the 12th floor. That's actually -- it's amazing how fast we're going. That 12th floor's completely formed out today and be poured this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

week. Next week's a great week because we get two floors next week. There is no 13.

Here's an image of the garage. The garage is on schedule to be a hundred percent complete next summer. Now, all the MEPs are being installed right now. Actually, those columns are being finished painted so we're in great shape there.

This is a view of the living shoreline. The living shoreline -- all the marine work from the land side, including the living shoreline is complete, so that's behind us. That allowed the dredging to start on time.

So here we have some of the major milestones. I can't see that far so I'm going to -- I can do it. The marine work, as I said, all the land side is complete. All the site utilities are complete to the project. The landscaping, we're prepping so we can start finish landscaping in the spring. We're on schedule to do that. I talked about the garage. Where that's -- we're on schedule to be a hundred percent complete by next summer.

The podium north central utility plant backup house, you walk through there now you can see the Sheetrock, we're painting. That's on schedule to be substantially complete next summer, which is about a year ahead, which is a big advantage because it allows us to have those utilities ready to go as we turn spaces on, so that's terrific.

The tower's up to -- up to the 12th floor. The podium is, like I said, a hundred percent erected and we're closing that in for the wintertime. It's going to allow us to work through the entire winter, which is terrific. So we get through the next three or four weeks and we're in pretty good shape. So we're looking forward to that. And the curtain wall is starting on the tower.

Big picture project schedules for the main resort, I think you can see that, as I said, we're on schedule. I'm going to do this from memory because I can't see any of those, but that's -- that's okay. But I hit all the major areas of the project. And so, that's in great shape. And we're ready to

start the roadways in the spring. And

Jacqui's going to get into that in a minute.

And I don't know if there's any questions on the schedule, or if you want a answer now, or we can come back to it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let's go ahead now, yeah.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Quick question. You know, we hear from MGM that there's kind of a drop-dead date by which they have to have the exterior of the building buttoned up. Your project's a little bit different. You kind of have three components to it. Are there, kind of, buttoned-up dates that you need -- are shooting for, so you can begin interior work in all three of those?

MR. CAMPOT: So we've started all the interior framing and electrical. Our drop-dead date for the podium is the first of the year, to have that enclosed and weather-tight. We're going to be ahead of that. We just about have it done now. And then, we're going to try to enclose the convention center, the last piece that we

erected by January. And that's going to be more of a push for us, quite frankly.

And the tower, getting the curtain wall started and up above the seventh floor, allows us to start fitting out the rooms. And that's in process. And we're aiming to get that done by mid December. Not all the way up, but above the seventh floor. So that's where we are right now.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Peter, when you say, "the curtain wall, is that the glass -- the orange or gold glass?

MR. CAMPOT: Exterior facade.

MS. KRUM: Wind bronze.

MR. CAMPOT: Wind bronze, as it's referred to, that wraps the tower. That's going to follow the tower right up. The tower's on schedule to be complete by March 1st, and that curtain wall will be right behind it. It's going to look like we're finished, you know, in February. But I can assure you, we've got a lot of interior work to do.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What's been the

biggest hurdle so far; you know, as you look back, what was the biggest problem that arose?

MR. CAMPOT: By far, the biggest challenge on this site is the site -- the remediation of the site was much -- it was much more difficult that I think anyone envisioned. Dirtier. And we sent soil to multiple locations. And we had -- in order to keep the cost down, we had over a dozen different soil types. And managing all of that remediation. And the train -- being able to take soil off site with the train was a huge benefit. But that was, by far, the biggest challenge. No question.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Interesting. And do I have it right, that you sent off site 660,000-tons?

MR. CAMPOT: That was then. I think we're closer to 800,000 now.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 800,000 tons. If you said 800,000-pounds, I would have been impressed. But 800,000 tons is just staggering.

MR. CAMPOT: Yeah.

Page 31

1	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is that delta
2	the dredging; are you counting now some of the
3	dredging? No?
4	MR. CAMPOT: No. That doesn't
5	include the dredging. I think the dredging
6	and I don't remember the number offhand, but I
7	think it's close to a 150,000 tons additional.
8	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So it's going to
9	be almost a million tons?
10	MR. CAMPOT: Yeah. It'll be a
11	million, I'm sure.
12	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: God almighty.
13	That's incredible.
14	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You just
15	have to think, what other development
16	opportunity could have cleaned up that site?
17	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Nothing.
18	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: None.
19	MS. KRUM: Well, without capping it
20	and doing, you know, sort of, a big-box
21	development, nothing else could have gone
22	there.
23	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: But I mean,
24	even now, dredging and I learned yesterday,

once you're done dredging there's still kind of a -- I don't know how you even you do this, put some layer of sand or fill --

MR. CAMPOT: We fill it back with 2 feet of clean material. So we basically bring it back to the elevation that it was at naturally, before we leave.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What about the risks going forward, or, you know, difficult activities?

MR. CAMPOT: I think, the biggest challenge that I see going forward is when you get into the finish trades. We have tremendous craftsmen here in Massachusetts, which everybody should be proud of. The question -- we need hundreds and hundreds of them. So can every subcontractor provide enough high-quality people. We know we can get the people. What we need is very, very high-quality people. The finishes are a challenge.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Like, what for example, Peter? Give an example of something that I --

MR. CAMPOT: You need 80 to a hundred tile setters.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But is there something special about this tile? You said you don't want just anybody.

MR. CAMPOT: Not anybody can set granite -- granite tile. That takes -- there's only a select number of craftsmen that can actually do that well. And our quality standards are very, very high.

We have a tremendous amount of millwork. We need hundreds of finish carpenters to install the millwork. We have not had a problem with labor to date, and I don't think we will. But we need to maintain those quality standards so that's -- that's what we're really concentrating on.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Fascinating.

MR. CAMPOT: We split the job -- the award of the subcontractors up into -- we split the millwork into eight or nine different packages so we get the best people from each -- many different sources. So -- but when you ask me, that's the one thing I

1 think about. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Interesting. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You mentioned 3 4 the finished parking garage. Are you going to 5 be using it to park some of the cars? 6 MR. CAMPOT: No, sir. 7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No. MR. CAMPOT: My goal is to finish 8 it. 9 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Keep it that 11 way. 12 MR. CAMPOT: Keep it clean. first floor we're using for temporary storage. 13 But if you -- we allowed to do that we'll 14 15 never finish it. So we're going to do our absolute best not to use it. We have about a 16 17 thousand spaces across the street right now, 18 which is really helping us out. So I think we 19 can avoid it. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thanks to the real 21 estate developer, Jacqui Krum. Any other 22 comments? I just want to say, the 23 Commissioners were taken on a tour of the site

yesterday. And I was saying to Director

Bedrosian, I've been trying to find the words to explain to other people what an extraordinary project it is. And maybe for people in your line of work it's not extraordinary. You do this, maybe, all the time. But to see the complexity of this, and to have a thousand people on that relatively small site doing different things, everything from one guy screwing in a little thing and another guy right next to him is bringing in a huge, multiton plate of stuff to put up against the wall. And how you coordinate the miles and miles, and miles of wires and pipes and tubes. It's just astonishing. If any of the media, who are watching, haven't been there, you really need to go see it. I've never seen anything like it. It's an incredible project.

MR. CAMPOT: Yeah. I want to just say, I've been doing this all my life and I find it extraordinary, so it's an extraordinary project, it truly is. It's a unique, and it's great to see how people pull together working as a team to make it happen.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

Yeah. Our

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: group was -- we were commenting on how -- the cleanliness. Every piece of that project is very clean, all the wires tied up. And, you know, kind of, the safety aspects were really apparent in that tour.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I'd echo I'd just say -- you know, I said this to Chris yesterday, as the rendering as we've seen to this point don't do the project justice. I mean, they've just --

MR. CAMPOT: Yeah. It's hard to capture scale in a photo. And I think it's the scale of it that is just extraordinary.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: But, you know, we need to remind ourselves, we're working with the biggest private construction project in the history of the Commonwealth. And this is what we're getting for that opportunity. It's great.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The other thing that's powerfully evident is the impact on Everett. You know, it just -- particularly, given the decision of the company to broaden the footprint so that that entire lower
Broadway area is going to be changed
dramatically and remediated dramatically.

But to think that this community, which has been a forgotten community in many ways, a postindustrial city that hasn't been able to get back on its feet once the postindustrial period started, having this incredible shot in the arm. And the energy and the enthusiasm in the town, the sense of spirit is palpable. And the impact is just going to be breathtaking.

So I don't mean to be patting us on the back. I mean to be patting you guys on the back. But -- and, you know, we'll continue to do our job of looking hard at everything we need to look hard at. But I think credit is due where credit is due. And this thing is, really, an astonishing project so far.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Well, we're reminded again, the commuter rail goes right by. Still thinking a nice stop right outside the back door would help.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 2 MS. KRUM: We agree. No. And thank 3 you for that. I mean, the City of Everett's 4 also been phenomenal to work with. 5 support that we've received from the residents 6 there, that -- from the mayor's office, from 7 the city council, from the planning board from -- you know, the entire staff there has 8 9 just been phenomenal. It's helped us get 10 through a lot of this. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good. 11 Great. 12 MR. BEDROSIAN: And Mr. Chairman, of 13 course, just for the record, we did our tour 14 in three groups with no more than two 15 commissioners. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Correct. 17 MR. BEDROSIAN: Just need to put that on the record. That's all. 18 19 MS. KRUM: We did. 20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We're used to 21 that. 22 MR. CAMPOT: It was just one more 23 logistical challenge at this project. 24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Actually, on

that note, Peter, do you have other -- do you provide others tours, like the ones you gave?

MS. KRUM: We go out on tours almost every day. We try to not to bother Peter with it too much. But, literally, there's a group out there every single day, if not multiple groups.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Just one last thing while I'm on this. You know, there's also this ripple effect over, across Everett towards the other -- to the west and along the Malden River and the Greenway area there, and the things that are happening there, I happened to mention to former Governor Dukakis about the impact on the Malden River. And even Governor Dukakis said, I didn't even know there was a Malden River. So the impact on this thing goes on and on. It's really amazing.

MS. KRUM: So speaking of impact, in other areas of Everett and beyond, while Peter's been working on the building, we've also been working very hard to get our offsite infrastructure improvements underway.

Just a reminder where we are, we are doing work, primarily in Wellington Circle, Sullivan Square, Santilli Circle, Sweetser and Lower Broadway. There's also some additional sites, but these are the main ones.

We have split the work into four different bid packages. Three of which have been bid and awarded. So the first one, which is the Broadway area, went to SPS New England. The second one, which is Route 16, went to J Derenzo. And Sullivan Square went to DWI Construction. We are still in the process of awarding the MBTA station. It's a relatively small package. So we'll update you when that is done.

In connection with our offsite infrastructure improvements, we made a commitment to make sure that everybody who uses that road, people, residents in the area, as well as people who commute through it, have constant access to what's going on and reminders, and information so that they can avoid the area, if they need to, and know how the commute will be impacted.

To that end, we've launched the Wynn For All site, website, which will be constantly updated with traffic -- traffic updates and any other community updates.

We've expanded it not just to include our work, because there's quite a bit of work that's going on that's unrelated to us, but it, obviously, impacts commuters, as well.

So, for instance, they're rebuilding the bridge of Wellington Circle. And they've done a phenomenal job with that, but it does impact the traffic to some extent, and we're going to include that in our updates.

MR. DELANEY: And I just received my first traffic notice from this site on Tuesday.

MS. KRUM: Yes. This is just another screen shot from our site. And to Joe's point, we've sent out our first notice because we have started work. This week was the first week we started work. We started in Sullivan Square with the installation of a concrete barrier for temporary pedestrian routes. Some demolition curbing and

installation of new curbing and sidewalk.

Also, Route 16, we've done some repairs to

this center median and installation of a new

wheelchair ramp and crosswalk striping.

So a notice like this will go out every single week to anyone who's signed up.

We'll also use text messages where people can just log onto the website. And there's numbers to call, if you notice something out of the ordinary, as well. Any questions on the offsite infrastructure?

Okay. On diversity, we are continuing to work very hard at it. I say "we," I mean Peter and his team, and Jennie Peterson. So in the design phase these are the contracts that were awarded. We have awarded about 5.5 million of contracts to MBEs, which is -- our goal was 7.9 percent. We're at 9 percent of total contracts.

4.3 million to WBEs, which is 7 percent. Our goal was 10 percent. VBEs, our goal was 1 percent, and we are at 6.6 percent, with a total of \$4 million worth of contracts. So that's a total of 13 million -- almost

1 14,000,000, 22.6 percent of contracts at a 2 goal of -- compared to a goal of 18.9 percent. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is just for 4 the design phase? 5 That's just the design MS. KRUM: 6 So the next one is the construction phase. 7 phase. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 8 Jacqui --9 Jacqui, real quick. Most of the design work 10 is completed, so the chance to maybe get that women's goal a little bit closer is --11 12 MS. KRUM: The vast majority of the 13 design work is complete. 14 MR. CAMPOT: I can assure you, 15 they're complete. 16 MS. KRUM: Peter tells us they're 17 complete. No changes. 18 MR. CAMPOT: They can draw anything 19 they want; I'm not going to issue it. 20 MS. KRUM: As you know, Wynn is 21 never complete. Even when we're open, we're 22 constantly looking and revising. So Peter has 23 a job for a very long time. 24 In terms of contracts for the

construction phase, on the MBE side we've 1 2 awarded about 60, \$61 million worth of That's 5.6 of total and our goal 3 contracts. 4 was 5 percent. On women businesses, a hundred and -- almost \$104 million. And today, we 5 6 exceeded the goal. We almost doubled the 7 goal. Our goal was 5.4 and we are at 9.6. VBEs, we are at about 29 million. We had a 8 9 goal of 1 percent and we're at 2.6. So we're 10 exceeding everything there, for a total of 177 million, which is about 16.3 percent of 11 12 all contracts with a goal of 11.4. 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Jacqui, these 14 numbers of the contract awards, are they 15 different companies or different -- all 16 different companies? 17 MS. KRUM: Very different companies. 18 we've got -- I don't know -- do you know, 19 approximately, how many companies? 20 MR. CAMPOT: Right there. 21 almost all -- they're almost all different. 22 MS. KRUM: Right. So you can see --23 MR. CAMPOT: You can see the numbers

There's a few that --

24

right there.

1 MS. KRUM: Almost each contract 2 award is a separate company. 3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is a separate 4 company. 5 MS. KRUM: Yeah. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's 7 remarkable. 8 MS. KRUM: Yeah. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 9 The reach, or 10 the broad scope of this is significant. MS. KRUM: As I said, we've had a 11 12 lot of help. We've worked very hard at it, 13 internally. Suffolk's group done a great job in terms of sourcing, as well. Jill's group 14 15 has been very useful to us. And we've worked 16 with a lot of other groups, as well. 17 And then, for the workforce, we have about 577 minority workers on site. Our goal 18 19 was 15.3 and we're currently at 25.5 percent. 20 We have 144 females on site. Our goal was 6.9 21 and we're at 7.1. And I think this is, by 22 far, the area that we struggle the hardest. 23 And we're hoping, as we get into, sort of, the 24

millwork and other trades that this number can

1 even increase.

On veterans, we have about a 122 workers. Our goal is 3 percent -- or was 3 percent, and we're at 6.8 percent.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think what's interesting here is -- you mentioned what a challenge it was to hire women. I think what's interesting is, the way the groups work together to encourage women to -- to come into the field. So that should have a long-term effect. It's not just this project. Those women are now trained and can make a career out of this, which, without the assistance of you and, as you say, Jill's group and other groups, those women would not have considered this as a viable option for their career. So I think the long-term effects here are just going to be tremendous.

MS. KRUM: Well, and the trades have been wonderful, too, in terms of opening it up to women. And so, what we're seeing is that, the women who are not necessarily working on our project, but because of our project they are getting into trades and are working on

Page 47

other projects. And I think, to your point, that's going to be the lasting effect of it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There's a lot more to come on this, as well. As you know, we're -- with the leadership of -- of particularly MGM and Wynn, and the gaming Commission and others, we're going to be announcing a big initiative to continue to push the idea of women in the construction force. And that'll be coming up within the next week or so. So we're going to try to keep this going.

Just one other comment. You know, we -- Wynn and the Gaming Commission got some understandable criticism for setting the goal, originally, for minority construction workers at 15 percent, which was the state goal.

That's why we did it. We made the point of saying, this is a floor. People took that, again understandably, with some skepticism, you know, could easily be an easy way out.

But you've demonstrated that it was a floor, and have exceeded it by a lot and made a real effort to it. So I think that's an important

one to take note of. You know, the 25 percent is beginning to get up there, and that's a -- that's a real number.

MS. KRUM: And it's something we do work on every single day. So even though we like where we are right now, we want to see it higher.

MR. CAMPOT: I think, actually, it'll go higher.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

MR. CAMPOT: I do. And the one thing about this project is, we talked about the scale of it, I've been working on projects all my life, but this is the first project where we've actually increased capacity in the market. We brought new people in. On a smaller project you can hit these goals because there's enough available people.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. CAMPOT: On our project, because of the scale of it, we've actually helped subcontractors grow. We've helped workers opportunities. It's really different. It's nice to see.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's really interesting.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: These are the limits that I think our research project is going to be able to corroborate.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. We'll be doing -- we'll be doing a study.

a study to have that ripple effect. It's very easy for us to ask a question. If this was your first job, if you're a woman, let's say, in the trades or other -- what might have gotten you there, and I think, again, a lot of this is going to be corroborated.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Jacqui, do

I understand that Jennie Peterson has been

promoted in some fashion, because she's a very

impressive --

MS. KRUM: We are very pleased to have stolen Jennie Peterson away from our construction team. And she is back in operations now. And she is going to be the director of employment, reporting to our VP of employment. So we're very pleased to have her

1 back on operations. 2 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: That's 3 great. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: She's been terrific. 5 6 MR. CAMPOT: That was only under the 7 understanding she still had to support the diversity initiative. 8 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That was a 10 negotiated settlement. 11 MS. KRUM: The work that she's done 12 and the contacts that she's made, and the 13 outreach is critical moving forward, as well. And we just thought it would be a wonderful 14 15 opportunity for her and for us. 16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just one 17 note on the veteran's side, I know, almost a 18 year ago, because tomorrow we celebrate 19 Veteran's Day, but you guys gave out red, 20 white and blue hard hats last year. 21 MS. KRUM: Peter wears one every 22 year. 23 Maybe it was COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 24 you I saw. But I saw a number of those hard

hats still on the project yesterday, still on site, so that's -- that's great news and acknowledgment.

MS. KRUM: So moving on to our community events and outreach. We continued over the quarter -- over the third quarter to reach out. As you can see, we participated in and posted a lot of events. We also continued our quarterly workforce diversity recognition awards. And this quarter it was awarded to -- and I'll forward to Edward G. Sawyer. So they were recognized, they got their lunches and their prizes.

The other event that we had that we just wanted to highlight, was we had -- this was a Veterans' event. And, Peter, do you want to --

MR. CAMPOT: So we had Secretary -- help me with his name.

MS. KRUM: Secretary of Veterans'
Services Sycter (phonetically) and -COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Urena?

MR. CAMPOT: Urena.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Secretary

1 Urena.

2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Secretary
3 Urena.

MS. KRUM: Yes, yes. So --

MR. CAMPOT: He came and we had a luncheon for all the veterans on the job site, and he spoke to all the veterans. And, quite frankly, I made the decision that day that I'd start wearing my Veterans' hard hat.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good job.

MS. KRUM: And then, while this was not in the third quarter, this was just last week, we thought it was important to highlight we had a wonderful event on site to celebrate the end of structural steel. So what we did was hosted a lunch for every construction worker on site. We did it on the casino floor. So what you can see is a thousand construction workers here with tables set up on the casino floor. And it was a great event for the community to recognize all the hard work our construction workers have put in and -- just a team celebration.

Page 53

1 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And can you help us understand what percentage of the 2 3 gaming floor that took up? 4 MR. CAMPOT: 30 percent, max. 5 MS. KRUM: So the mezzanine's, 6 obviously, not featured in here. And this 7 was, what, about a third of the --Twenty-five, 30 percent 8 MR. CAMPOT: 9 of the gaming floor. 10 MS. KRUM: Gaming floor. 11 MR. CAMPOT: Yeah, gaming floor 12 right there. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does Sawyer 14 qualify -- isn't there going to be eventual 15 drawing for somebody who gets to go to Vegas 16 for a -- wasn't that the deal, that you get --17 you're going to get interim awards, and then 18 all the winners get a drawing --19 MS. KRUM: Get put into a pool, and 20 the lucky ones go to Vegas, yes. 21 MR. CAMPOT: They have the 22 opportunity to give back. 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: This is 24 really important, though, for morale and how

Page 54

1 you're being received in the community, taking 2 the time under a tight time frame to recognize 3 and celebrate. Those are really important 4 things so... 5 MR. BEDROSIAN: I was on the site 6 last Friday -- last Friday with Joe, John and 7 Bob DeSalvio. And as we were going around, I probably heard four or five people thank 8 Mr. DeSalvio for his lunch. 9 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Really? MR. BEDROSIAN: Yeah. 11 12 MS. KRUM: It was a good lunch. 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah. Free food well accepted. 14 15 MS. KRUM: Well accepted. Any other 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: questions, comments? 17 18 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just one 19 question. You talked about Jennie's new 20 responsibilities. Can you give us an idea, as 21 we're 582 days out, kind of, how the 22 operational employment team is beginning to be

23

24

organized?

MS. KRUM:

Sure.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:

Obviously,

2 you have a big hurdle, in terms of local

3 hiring and recruitment, as well. You know,

4 we're getting to that crucial point with MGM.

Can you give us an idea of how that work is

6 moving?

7

5

MS. KRUM: Sure. We are starting

8 right now, in the next couple of months, we

9 will hire our head of HR, who will build up

10 the HR team, which is, I believe 12, sort of,

senior level people. The focus of that team

right now will be, sort of, on workforce

development. How we're going to recruit

14 people, what the job positions are. Benefits.

15 Getting everything organized. We're only

16 going to hire about another hundred people

over the course of the next 12 months. The

majority of our hire will take place in the

three to four months before we open. But a

20 lot of the training and everything has to be

21 put in place right now, so that'll be the

22 focus of the management team.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Director Bedrosian

may have talked to you about this, and it's premature for you folks, but we're going to be undertaking this issue of trying to decide which nongaming employee job category should be exempt, in our judgment. And the more we know from the employers, who know what those job descriptions do, really, and how they relate to issues of security and safety, and integrity and so forth, the better we'll be informed to try to make those decisions. you may or may not have the same views as MGM, but if you could do that and give us your recommendations about which categories should be exempt, we're going to be making those -trying to make those decisions right off the bat, you know, sometime pretty soon.

MS. KRUM: We're finalizing our compendium now. And as soon as we have that, we certainly will work with your staff to make sure we give them any input we can.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. That'd be great. Anybody else? Thank you very much. Great.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thanks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Page 57

1 Impressive. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Joe, you did a 3 great job. 4 MR. DELANEY:

> COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Thank you.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very

much. Next up is Item No. 6, racing division, Dr. Lightbown.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: Good morning, Commissioners.

11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good morning.

12 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Good

13 morning.

5

6

7

8

9

10

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning. 14

15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 16 Good

17 morning.

> MS. LIGHTBOWN: Today we're discussing the applications to conduct live racing in 2018. We're going to go out of order from my memo and have Suffolk first. have Bruce Barnett with me to answer any questions you might have.

> > For this application period, we

received two applications, Plainridge

Racecourse to conduct a hundred days of
harness racing from April 16 through

November 29, and Suffolk Downs to conduct six
days of running horseracing on July 7th and
8th, August 6th and 4th and 5th, and
September 1st and 2nd, with the possibility of
adding some days.

In order to grant the racing license, the Commission must take into consideration the criteria provided in Chapter 128A, Section 3(i), and any additional appropriate information you gather. criteria is the financial ability of the applicant to operate a racetrack, the maximization of state revenues, the suitability of the racing facilities to operate at the time of the year for which the dates are granted, large groups of spectators require safe and convenient facilities, having and maintaining proper physical facilities for these race meetings, and affording fair treatment to the economic interest and investments of those, who, in good faith, have

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

provided and maintained these facilities.

In order for the Commission to determine if these criteria are met, you may consider the application materials provided by the applicants, and testimony and comments received from the public. We've already held the public hearings for both of these applicants and gotten comments that are in your packets.

Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, or
Suffolk Downs, meets the requirements of
Chapter 128A, Section 3(i) and it's the only
facility this year to apply for thoroughbred
racing. With six days to provide racing, they
will also meet the requirements that the
Massachusetts session laws acts of 2015
changed on the simulcasting to one to 50 days,
and they'll meet that.

My recommendations are similar to what we've done in previous years. I recommend that the Commission approve the application with the follow conditions: One, that Suffolk have an independent expert review the track surface prior to racing. That's

2.1

actually part of -- falls into with the NTRA safety racing requirements, and they're more than willing to do it, and it's been very successful.

We'll have Suffolk Downs request, in writing to the Commission, how much money they would like from the Racehorse Development Fund and how it will be spent. Where they will not be using all of the thoroughbred purse money available, we don't hand it down every week, like we do with the others in that fund. So what they do is, they let us know a little bit before they're going to need the money how much they anticipate in purses.

And Suffolk Downs will notify the Commission in writing, if they're going to race more than the six days, at least 30 days before the races are conducted. And, obviously, the sooner they can let us know, the better. I have staff that's asking now what the days are going to be so they can reserve those days off for next year. Most of our racing staff is seasonal and they have other jobs, so they're very eager to make sure

1 they have those days off.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Alex, just for clarification, the review of the track is prior to all six races, or is it prior to each weekend that they're going to conduct the races.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: It's prior to the beginning of the races. We do it once.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:

MS. LIGHTBOWN: And that's -- one of the reasons, also, is that there's not really any training over the track before they race, so it's important to have that extra safety built in.

Okay.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Right.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: And then, fourth, that Suffolk Downs will provide their purse agreement to the Commission as they get it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So the one piece we're asking for, in addition to what we typically do, is to try to notify us at least 30 days in advance, if, as they did this year, they'll add a couple of days to racing, correct?

MS. LIGHTBOWN: Correct.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I actually expound on that, and just ask that any supplemental requests of money from the Racehorse Development Fund be made in advance as well, ideally. And I understand, you know, just from last year there was a good opportunity to add races because people showed up and there was no -- not enough races, it was a good thing. But it hinged on the notion of asking additional monies.

I would rather have us approve those before that -- that those races take place, not after, or at least have somebody in your position, Dr. Lightbown, approve them before -- before they come. And I understand that they -- we could have managed that last time by decreasing the purses of the subsequent races, but that was never, at least, my understanding, so I would just like to make that point.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: Yeah. We've had levels -- talks at the staff level about how to limit the number of races so that, you

know, it kind of fits in with what we've been doing. You know, in their application, I think most of the race -- they asked for between 10 and 11 races per day. Obviously, it may go, you know, over that a little bit. But I don't anticipate, and from talking to Chip Tuttle, he doesn't anticipate, either, doing the 15 races each day on one weekend.

MR. BARNETT: If I may,

Commissioner, thanks for the question. And

Chip apologizes, he's traveling out of state

so he can't be here today himself.

The issue with too much forewarning on the actual subscription of the races is a challenge because it happens in the days right before. So, certainly, communication between Chip and the racing staff and Alex is one thing. Getting back before the Commission that quickly would be a logistical problem, I think. But it can be managed, as we talked about before.

And, in fact, at the last weekend, again, there were more owners and trainers offering their horses than we had spots for

that we were anticipating, and so they did not just add extra races. And in fact, put in a preference that I think Chip might have spoken about when he was here for the public hearing, on those days that were over -- races that were oversubscribed so that people who had supported the program in 2012, 2013, and 2014 were given a preference on -- on getting into those races. So those management techniques are there.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. And I understand it's a good problem to have, if you will, if there's more people that are interested and here and, you know, ready to It's really just the notion of requesting monies for additional purses retroactively that I have a bit of a -- you know, concern. And I understand that we can only come before the Commission every two weeks, necessarily, and that's part of my point about either understanding that there's a delegation of that judgment call to the executive director or Dr. Lightbown in those cases. Still, my point is about seeking approval and prior to,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

	Page 65
1	rather than after.
2	MR. BARNETT: Point taken.
3	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.
4	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else? I
5	guess we need do we need a motion? Yes, we
6	do.
7	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mr. Chair, I
8	move that the Commission approve the
9	application of Sterling Suffolk Racecourse LLC
10	for live running horseracing in 2018 to
11	include the conditions as just outlined.
12	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.
13	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
14	discussion? All in favor? Aye.
15	COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
16	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
17	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
18	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
19	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes
20	have it unanimously. Thank you.
21	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.
22	MR. BARNETT: Thank you very much.
23	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you.
24	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You want to take a

1 quick break before we do?

2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah, that'd be great.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We'll take quick break.

(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. We are reconvened now from public meeting No. 228, and back to Dr. Lightbown.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: So our other applicant for racing is Plainville Gaming and Redevelopment, Plainridge Racecourse. They also met the requirements of 128A, Section 3(i), and they're the only facility to apply for harness racing this year. With a hundred days of live racing, they would also meet the requirements of Mass General Laws Chapter 128C, Section 2, which is the requirement for their ability to simulcast. Plainridge raced 105 days in 2015, 115 days in 2016, and they're on schedule to complete the 125 days of racing in 2017, as described at Mass

1 General Laws Chapter 23K, Section 24.

Plainridge Racecourse and the Harness Horsemen's Association of New England are here today to give presentations regarding the number of live racing days for 2018. I'll be happy to answer any questions you have, and General Counsel Blue can also weigh in on some of the legal issues.

One thing to say at the beginning is just that, traditionally, racing days were tied in with simulcasting and the law, so the number was basically -- if it was a hundred days, they needed to average nine races a day, so that gave you 900 races.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: By statute, you had to average --

MS. LIGHTBOWN: Right, by statute. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: Yeah. And with the economics in those days, the tracks, sometimes they ran a few more extra races, but usually they stuck pretty much to that amount.

So one thing that is different now is, with the racehorse development money for

the purse accounts, there's money so the number of the days of racing isn't tied on that end to a certain number of races. So in talking to Steve O'Toole, when he first mentioned he wanted to decrease the number of days, I was concerned that the amount of purse money per race would go way up. And he explained that he's not looking to do, you know, the nine races a day. He's looking to try to, maybe, move the races that would be on the day that they would draw and spread those among the other days.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: When you say "go way up," you mean, the amount that they would be asking for from the Commission, from the use of the fund would be increased?

MS. LIGHTBOWN: Well, the amount from the fund is set, again, by the horseracing committee and that stays the same. But instead of looking to race a hundred days with 900 races, it would be more like, you know, a hundred days with 1200 races. Something along those ways.

So I think that's important to

1 frame, that they're not necessarily -because, certainly, from a horseman's 2 3 perspective, if you're talking a loss of days, 4 you're automatically thinking you're going to 5 lose races. And that is a problem, you know. 6 So I wanted to make clear that, now, 7 we not only have the racing statute with the simulcasting and the requirement of days, but 8 9 now we also have the gaming legislation, and 10 we have the Racehorse Development Fund. 11 the -- tying those two together, you know, 12 there's opportunity to race more than the 13 traditional nine races a day. 14 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: How many races 15 a day did you -- did we race -- did you race this last calendar year? 16 This one now, 17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 18 present? 19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Present, yeah. 20 MR. O'TOOLE: We've been averaging 21 9.57 races a day. 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 9.5. 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I had a 24 process question. Are we looking -- I mean,

we've read your submissions. Each of you submitted your -- your thoughts on race days, and we did hear you at the hearing. Did we want them to talk about their submission, or just ask questions, if we have them?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, let me just add to that. I think there are two issues on the table. One is, are we bound by statute, or are we not bound by statute to require 125 days? That's the first question. Second question is, if we are not bound by statute, do we approve 125 or 100, or something in between, right?

So now, the question is, do we want to get presentations from each of the two groups on their presentations, or just jump in before we discuss, or do we want to just jump in?

an additional question to the one you posed.

Reading the briefs, there seems to be, at least, a differing of opinions between whether they have complied with the escalating nature of the three years that have passed.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's the first 2 question. Right. That's the first question. 3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I thought you 4 were going, like, from the third -- going forward. 5 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No, no, no. Are 7 we still in the three -- in effect, in the 8 three-year period. It's the question raised in the briefs. 9 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I mean, we've 13 read your submissions. But are you 14 comfortable in just asking questions at this 15 point, or would you like to hear from them, I 16 quess, is my --17 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I think, the 18 opportunity to kind of have a -- I also -- I 19 was at the hearing with you, I've read the 20 submissions, but I think for anybody who might 21 be watching and, obviously, there might be 22 breeders, owners, trainers, that we could do a 23 quick synopsis, I think to the Chairman's

24

point on these --

1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Two issues. 2 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: -- kind of, 3 two issues. You know, did they meet that kind 4 of ramp-up period? Are we past that? 5 now in a discretionary phase? And the second 6 piece being, you know, what's our thoughts on 7 a hundred versus 125, et cetera, et cetera. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. All right. 9 So in answer -- so let's have a quick, sort 10 of, synopsis of the presentations from the two 11 briefs and then we'll jump into questions. 12 MS. LIGHTBOWN: So today, I have 13 Steve O'Toole, director of racing for Plainridge Racing, and Bob McHugh, the 14 15 president of the Harness Horsemen's 16 Association. We also have Chris McErlean, who 17 is the director of racing operations for 18 Penn Gaming. If you have questions, he's 19 sitting behind. And we have Marty Corey, who 20 is a attorney for the New England Harness 21 Horsemen's Association, that can also answer

MR. O'TOOLE: Thank you,

Commissioners. I'd just like to reiterate

questions. Steve.

22

23

that at the hearing in Plainville, we made the points that Plainridge -- I believe we made the points that Plainridge meets all the criteria for licensure under 128A.

From that hearing, the discussion on days came up and brings us here this morning. We believe that the Commission is not bound by the 125-day requirement going forward, and the Commission should allow for an adjustment of days due to the three criteria set forth in Chapter 23K, Section 24, which is field size, demand and racing performance.

We were hoping our horse -- we were hoping that our horsemen would agree that a schedule that is reasonable for them to fill and offer better quality racing with greater wagering possibilities for our customers would benefit everyone. We negotiated in good faith with proposals offering multiyear commitments on our part. However, I failed to convince the horsemen that this would be a better situation for all of us, and we failed to agree on a number of days coming up or down from our respective positions.

2.1

We believe the legal argument outlined in our memo was consistent with the intent of the law, as well the interpretation by the Commission. This, in part, evidenced by the many conversations that we've had here in public meetings over the past several years and hearings, where we have candidly discussed the race meets and what effect the added number of racing days would have on our industry.

The three-year scheme the legislature laid out with the ramp-up to 125 days was understood by the Commission and Plainridge, as we applied for 105 days in 2015, 115 days in 2016, and 125 days for this year. We fully understood the intent of the legislation, and we have fulfilled this commitment to the best of our ability.

At the time, we were aware that we could take a look at those three years of racing activity and move forward with a racing schedule that would provide for the best racing product that we could offer, optimizing our field size and the number of racing on our

racing performances. That, at least in my mind, was the -- what was behind 24 Section C.

In our annual reports, I fully admitted that I thought that the horsemen had done a good job of attempting to keep up with the demand of the racing schedule, the extra days and the four-day weeks. However, I believe that it's time now to took at where we are and evaluate if we can do a better job. And I believe we can do a better job without interrupting the horsemen's racing schedule and having an opportunity to race every week in the coming year, 2018. So I encourage the Commission to approve our schedule as submitted, as it is in the best interest of harness racing as a whole at Plainridge.

In its simplicity, we need larger fields to drive handle. There's still a need for horses in each and every racing performance that's not being filled by our horsemen. We'd prefer to race more races per performance, and in the process eliminate costs that are unnecessary, not just for us, but for the horsemen and the Commission. But

considering the week to three days the same -or condensing the week to three days, the same
amount of horses will get raced, and we'll be
able to flush out shorter fields, offer more
races on each racing performance and make much

better product to offer our customers.

As you can see in one of our exhibits, Exhibit B, there's an increase in field size and racing performance, and that's the race per days. And the average handle per race increases, as well. It's been documented over the last three years that this has happened at Plainridge. There are racing -there are racing -- there are racing opportunities that go unfulfilled in the majority of our races, and there has not been more than enough horses to race in our races claimed by the horsemen. If there was more than enough, our average field size would be over nine, not at 7.38 at this time. stretching out the available horse supply over four days, when the same thing can be accomplished more efficiently over three days, is unfair to the customer and to Plainridge.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

Race days are costly to run. Satellite fees, tote fees, TV production, insurance costs and more can be eliminated, at the same time produce a higher handle with full fields and a full card of race -- races on each racing performance, maximizing our efforts and our revenues.

time for the submission because it was a

we did get -- put together 13 tracks.

half-mile surface.

little bit difficult to do the polling. But

tracks of the same type of racing that we do

over 5/8ths mile surface, and three over

Dayton, Hoosier Park, Rosecroft Raceway,

Meadows, Mogehan -- Mohegan Sun at Pocono

Downs, Scioto Downs, Harris Philadelphia,

Plainridge, Tioga, Vernon, for the bigger

We've put together a chart, not in

They included Hollywood

19

20

21

22

23

24

and Freehold Raceway for the half-mile tracks. Those -- when you look at those 10

tracks, and Saratoga Harness, Yonkers Raceway

tracks of our size, we rank eighth in field -average field size. For races per day, we're at the bottom of the list. The average races

per day for those tracks are 12. Twelve is an optimum number to flush out our customers and offer a good product.

The only regional tracks with lower averages, Vernon and Tioga, have less days, and they're struggling with horse supply, as evidenced by our Exhibit C, which refers to race day cancellations. And right now, that -- those race-day cancelations are at 38, not 36. Since last week, Freehold raceway has canceled two races due to lack of entries -- or two race days, due to lack of races.

The 20 cancelations at Scarborough
Downs was predicted earlier in the year, when
Maine horsemen realized they didn't have a
accurate -- adequate number of horses to fill
the demand. At the May 19th meeting of the
Maine Harness Racing Commission, two
statements were made. One by Mike Timmons,
former racing commissioner, and the president,
now, of Cumberland Farmers club, and
Wendy Ireland, former executive director of
the Maine Horsemen's Association and vice
president of the Maine Breeders Association.

2.1

1

2

3

4

5

Mr. Timmons stated, "We need a days.

solution to the horse problem." And Ms. Wendy Ireland stated that "We are racing too many There is a shortage of horses in this country. It's a wide problem, and we need to

I was going to include an exhibit

6

reduce days." And that was May 19th of this

7

year.

8

9 that -- of how many total horses it takes to

10

put on the meter at Plainridge, but I wanted

11 12 to try to keep this as brief and not confuse the message, but since the horsemen included

13

in their memo as Exhibit No. 4, I'd like to

14

point to the large number of horses it takes

15

to run a meet longer than a hundred days. We

16

have entertained over 900 hundred horses so

17

far at this year's meet, and they've not

18

So where are these horses going to

19 20

come from for these long meets?

adequately filled our demand.

21

Unfortunately, that's not coming from the

22

breeder's shed. Our Exhibit D shows a massive

23 24

standardbred foals reported for registration,

decline in foals reported for registration,

in a 10-year period, from 2005 to 2015, which are the completed breeding seasons so far.

That went -- the foals reported in 2005 went from 10,463 to 5,842. They're not coming from the industry sales rings either. All the major horse auctions are offering less horses and less yearlings at the national sales, as well.

The Horsemen's Association uses the term "stability," or that they need stability.

Our 100 days schedule offers stability. Same number of weeks, the length of the season will be the exactly the same, similar racing opportunities, and we have offered to do this over a period of years.

This should be a two-way street.

The horsemen want guarantees and dates, but they're not willing to commit sufficient entries for the dates that they think they need. Plainridge needs stability as well.

And sufficient entries to work -- to work with would provide that stability.

Just today, we're drawing for next
Monday and Tuesday. Monday's entries were 75,

2.1

Tuesday's entries were 45. My secretary, right now, is sending out text messages to all the horsemen to try and fill that Tuesday card. Monday he'll get by, but he's having a very difficult time with Tuesday. He makes things work, but we're always stealing from Peter to pay Paul when he's putting races together.

The horsemen's point to -- that we've increased handle from 2014 to 2017, based on a 56-day increase in that time period, a 203 percent handle increase. In 2014, we raced on Saturdays and Sundays. We guaranteed an increase in their purses for that year and handled only \$7 million. We're not -- we're not comparing apples to apples, when you use the year 2014 to show a growth in a handle. Actually, a more accurate snapshot would be 2013 to 2017, because that was a year when we raced 80 days and I think we did abut \$11 million pre, you know, slot-infused purses.

The horsemen also point out that while our total is increasing, the national

handle is decreasing. While that's true -and every day there's a new update on the USTA
website, and this is yesterday's update, while
it's true that handle has decreased total
wagers, days have decreased, as well. So they
go hand in hand. But what is interesting to
note is that, our handle, right now, is
averaging \$19,000 a race. And that's severely
outdone by the national average shown on
yesterday's report at \$37,000, which is
actually up from last year. So race days are
down, average race handle is up. And that's
exactly what we're trying to accomplish here.

The horsemen appoint -- point to the number of horses claimed last year and this year, and this is a good sign that claiming has gone up. But claiming a horse simply transfers a horse from one owner to another owner racing at the same meet. It doesn't necessarily mean that we're getting more horses from an increasing field size through those claims.

And if we're to use claiming as an indicator, in 2003 there were 105 horses

claimed at the Plainridge meet. The most of any season ever, 2003. We average right around 12 races a day with an average field size over eight. We handle \$4.3 million on track, and \$27.5 million export, a total of \$31.8 million. And that's the best year that we've ever had.

All the purse money, \$3.8 million that was awarded that year came from racing-related revenue streams. The 2003 season was a 100-day meet. And that's -- all those figures are in the 2003 -- on page 51, the 2003 Mass State Racing Commission annual report.

And while I was initially impressed with the Horsemen's Association Exhibit 3 that showed growth with owner participation from 2015 to 2017, the numbers -- the numbers actually don't add up. So I'd like to offer a correction for that. In column one, the count is off by 20. And in column three, 2017, it's showing a growth of 768. The actual number, when you add those numbers up, is 624. What's less impressive is how flat the Massachusetts

Page 84

1 ownership participating has been. 111 in 2015, up seven to 118 in 2016, and down one 2 3 this year of 117. 4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Steve, what are -- I got lost in that reference. Can 5 6 you -- is this -- what exhibit is this? 7 MR. O'TOOLE: Exhibit 3. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: From their letter. 8 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: From their 10 letter? MS. LIGHTBOWN: Of the horsemen's 11 submissions. 12 13 MR. O'TOOLE: Of the horsemen's submissions. 14 15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And you 16 corrected -- in your mind, there's -- there's 17 numbers off. Which ones were those again, I'm sorry? You said, the 2016 counts? 18 19 MR. O'TOOLE: Yes. I have it right 20 If you don't mind, I'd present to you. 21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just tell them 22 to the me the same way you did. 23 MR. O'TOOLE: Column 1 should be 24 385. Column 2 is correct. And Column 3 is --

1 should be 624. 2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. 3 MR. O'TOOLE: And if you note, the 4 Mass owners are -- have participated in -- are 5 fairly level. 6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And, 7 Mr. O'Toole, your numbers come from, your corrected numbers? 8 9 MR. O'TOOLE: I had everyone in my 10 office add them. 11 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. So 12 it's -- okay. So the only correction is 13 not -- I see what you're saying. It's just 14 the total -- they were totaled incorrectly; 15 it's not that you had another source for 16 numbers. 17 MR. O'TOOLE: No. It was 18 eye-popping when I looked at it, and I 19 wondered why. Then, I found out why. 20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Right. 21 MR. O'TOOLE: And lastly, this being 22 a discussion about race dates, I think the --23 HHANE missed the mark on what a racing 24 performance means in relationship to race

dates. Racing performance is the number of races conducted in a day. That's identified in 128C.

However, on behalf of my hardworking crew, I will take the track records as a compliment to the excellent and safe racing surface we have at Plainridge and their hard work. That is, as you know, one of the highlights that I give each to you each year in my racing report. I take pride in presenting you with the number of track records that come from our racing surface and our race track, and the special horses that create those records.

Speaking of a track record, we did set a track record this year with in the Spirit of Massachusetts Trot, with JL Cruze. He crushed the old track record, which was -- which was fun. It only cost us \$250,000 to do that. But I would like to say, you know, what a good event it was. And that event was not just planned out a few weeks in advance. My race secretary found a distinct hole in the national calendar to place that race, where we

2.1

could get the best horses and the best drivers to participate with us on that day. And we're trying to identify a few other options for us in the national calendar.

In the proposed calendar that the horsemen have presented, they've moved that race -- proposed to move that race to

June 30th, which would fall right on top of the Cleveland Trotting Classic, where all those horses competed last year. And, also, would be in conflict with the Pennsylvania All Stars, where all the major stables and best drivers go on that night, if the schedules stay the same, which the national schedules usually do, kind of, follow year to year.

So I'd just like -- I'd just like to point out that while -- you know, I don't want to comment on the rest of the schedule. I do want to show you that we put a lot of thought -- and we didn't just thread a needle for that particular race. We threaded a needle with the time of day so we could get those drivers back to the Meadowlands.

They all participated in stake

events that night, elimination events that
were important races the following week. They
weren't so important that night, but they
needed to drive those horses for the following
week's event. So we hustled them down to the
Mansfield airport and got them back there and
they didn't miss a race.

So we -- you know, we really had to, you know, thread a needle, not just with the date, but with the time of that day.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Steve, does the -does the day that that race fall have anything
to do with our total race day discussion?
That's a whole different issue, right?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: One of the reasons they couldn't agree is they wanted to move that. When they were negotiating, they wanted to move that.

MR. O'TOOLE: There's an exhibit that moves that race -- proposed by the horsemen, that moves that race up a whole month, and it was thrown on a date --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. But what does that have to do with whether you have a

	Page 89
1	hundred or 125 race days? I don't get that.
2	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Nothing
3	really.
4	MR. O'TOOLE: They put it in
5	their they're the ones that offered it.
6	They put it in I'm just making a comment on
7	it that
8	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. But we're
9	not going to make a decision on which day you
10	should run that race, right; that's not up to
11	us?
12	MR. O'TOOLE: No.
13	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. All right.
14	MR. O'TOOLE: All's I'm saying is,
15	this is what they proposed and it doesn't fit.
16	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: So your goal
17	is to still do that race next year but have it
18	on
19	MR. O'TOOLE: We'll have it in
20	we'll have it in the window where it fits in
21	the national calendar, which is going to be,
22	probably, that same week.
23	So nowhere in the horsemen's
24	testimony at the 25th at the hearing on the

25h, or in the memo, has a reference to the wagering public or the fan. We took steps this year to engage the customers and help increase handle with guaranteed pools and new jackpot wagers. With that, we need good field size. Wile purses are mainly supported by gaming revenues, now, we still feel we're responsible to put on a better product for our customers, and this schedule, definitely, would help us to do that.

So for all these reasons,

Commissioners, I ask you to look favorably

upon a hundred-day schedule, if you feel it's

reasonable.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I have a couple of quick questions. One, I think I understand that the reason more races on a given day helps, is because there are certain days that you're more likely to get some ship-ins, where that fourth day in the week you're less likely to do that. Is that one of the reasons, or is that the main reason you feel like it's advantageous to have more races on, say, a three-day schedule per week; is

that to help with the field size, correct?

MR. O'TOOLE: Sure. That's

basically correct, yes.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.

MR. O'TOOLE: We feel that we're continually stealing from Peter to pay Paul to meet our requirement this year for 125 days, stretching the week out over four days, average averaging around nine races a day, which means that some of those days -- if we go -- we can't foresee what's going to happen on Thursday and Friday, so on Monday and Tuesday we go 11 races, 10 races, we save a little bit for the end of the week.

My race secretary has a very good handle on what horses are out there and where they're coming from and what's available. And a lot of times, at the end of the week, he's scrambling to put together seven or eight races to have a respectable card on the last day of the week.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And is that what you mean by stealing from Peter to pay Paul?

	Page 92
1	MR. O'TOOLE: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Managing the
3	number of races between days, essentially?
4	MR. O'TOOLE: Yes. Managing the
5	number of horses and races.
6	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's always
7	field size and race number of races?
8	MR. O'TOOLE: Right.
9	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And I guess
10	it's knowing what other venues, what days they
11	race, so knowing those horses are available to
12	ship in on the off days here.
13	The second question I have,
14	Mr. O'Toole, was it's my understanding that
15	the betting public bets more frequently on a
16	larger card. Meaning, more races more
17	horses per race, as well as more races per
18	day?
19	MR. O'TOOLE: Correct.
20	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Could you
21	help me understand why that is?
22	MR. O'TOOLE: Sure. Our customer
23	goes comes into the program stand and wants
24	to buy a product that has some meat to it.

1 And when there's only seven races on a card, 2 they'd rather bet -- they'd rather buy a 3 program for another track with fuller fields 4 and like tracks that are going at the same 5 time, Dayton or Pocono, the Meadows. 6 goes 14 races. There's more value for them. 7 It's a little bit -- it's a little bit faster They've more wagering opportunities 8 paced. because their fields are fuller. And we wind 9 10 up, you know, being, you know, second, third, fourth fiddle on the simulcast chart. 11 12 We've actually had customers come 13 back and say we only have seven races today. 14 Give me this program instead of that one. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 15 I see. 16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Steve -- I'm 17 sorry. 18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Please, go 19 ahead. 20 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I had two, 21 kind of, initial reactions when I looked at the hundred-day request. The first kind of 22

gut reaction was, 125 days back to a hundred,

we've seen the success that Plainridge Park

23

and, obviously, the harness racing has had

2 because of how The Gaming Act was constructed.

My first reaction is, are we taking our foot off the gas because we're having this level of success. The second reaction I had is, you shared other information about other tracks -- and I'll ask Mr. McHugh this question, but are we becoming, kind of, this economic stalwart in a region that is obviously not doing what we're doing, in terms of encouraging -- encouraging breeding. You know, putting more money into purses so some of these other tracks are doing -- I mean, are we kind of becoming the loan stalwart in the northeast that's really the only one boosting harness racing?

MR. O'TOOLE: Actually, no.

Actually, all of our competitors are doing the exact same thing that we are. So that's why we're in such severe competition. Some of the tracks that I mentioned, Freehold Raceway, does not have gaming attached to its racing operations. So that's one track that still offers purses that are solely funded through

1 the parimutuel revenue streams.

But Saratoga, which is only three hours away, less than three hours away, Scarborough Downs, which we get -- we do get a fair share of horses from. But they have gaming attached to their purses. Yonkers is -- right now, it's only 3-1/2 hours down the road, they give away the most purse money in the nation. It's huge purses on a weekly basis.

So we're actually in -- Vernon Downs and Tioga, they both have gaming attached and they're struggling right now. And their purses are pretty high because they're consolidating race days and consolidating races. So their purses are actually pretty high, on average. They go -- I think they go 88 days, and so they get -- I think their purse account is about \$7 million. So ours is about eight, theirs is about seven. We do 125 days, they're doing 88 days. They can offer higher purses per race per day to their horsemen to keep them there. So it's very difficult to attract stables to, you know,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

ship in when we're -- we're in the middle of what we're doing they're doing.

Some of them are starting to, you know, come down a little bit. Scarborough -Maine and Scarborough Downs has canceled 20 days this year. And next year they're going to be racing less days. So they'll be able to boost their purses up and keep their horses where they are.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: So I did a little bit back-of-the-envelope math. If this year you raced 125 days, roughly, 9-1/2 races a day, you'd come out with 1187-1/2 races. If we moved to a hundred days and your goal of hitting 12 races a day, we're up to 1200 races over the season. So you're almost picking up a full day of racing, in terms of what the card would be for that day.

MR. O'TOOLE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But how do you -how do you populate the races each race with
more horses, if you're having the same number
or more races?

MR. O'TOOLE: That's a great

question. And so, what happens now is, you know, maybe it'd be 1200, maybe it'd be a little less. It'll be whatever the horsemen give us for entries. But right now, if we need to make seven races on a Friday to meet our legislative requirements, my race secretary might take 10 horses that would have been one race and make two, five-horse fields and go with that and call it a day.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But that -- wasn't that -- if you got the same number of horses you would have the same problem with your 11th and 12th or 10th and 11th race.

MR. O'TOOLE: The races that have raced on the fourth day would melt them into our --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Would come back.

MR. O'TOOLE: -- to our purse.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You would have higher fields -- field size, which, at least presumably, increases the handle, eventually. Which is what I think -- what I think we should be paying attention is where we rank in terms of handle. It's been increasing, which

is really good news, but what attracts other bettors is, you know, what the prizes are.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think I know what you're asking, and I think I know the answer. When you spread to that fourth day, now you're competing against tracks that are racing that same day, or maybe many tracks. And in three days, they look for the days - I know Monday and Tuesday are big that other tracks may -- there may not be a many other tracks racing the same day so that -- and if you're someone who's contemplating where to race that day and there's a card of, say, at Plainridge of -- of 11 or 12 races that day, you could maybe race several of your horses so it's worth your while to ship in for that day.

So I think I understand that. That if you cut it to three days and it's not interfering as much with other racetracks, you're getting more ship-ins.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So you're going to --

MR. O'TOOLE: That's true. As well

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Page 99

as, a lot of these stables, you know, try to come as many days as they can, but some of them are shipping, you know, upwards of 200 miles to come and participate. They can't come four days a week. They just can't do it. A lot of them come down on Mondays, stay over a Tuesday. They might come back on a Thursday. But then, as Commissioner Cameron noted, they have other commitments other places on the weekends. But it's just a very -- it's a grind for them to continue to do that, you know, four times a week.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But is it -- the three variables are days, races and horses.

And if -- is it your -- if the number of horses stay the same, which Commissioner

Cameron says they don't, there's a new -- there's more being shipped in, but setting that aside that for the moment, if you have the same number of races in three days as you have in four days, you don't increase the size of field of any one of those -- you got the same number of races, doesn't matter how many days you put them over. The field size has to

stay the same. You can only -- if you move four into three and reduce the number of races, then you can increase the field, right; am I missing something?

MR. O'TOOLE: No. Your argument -or your comments make sense. However, when a
race secretary's putting together races, he'll
split races apart, in order -- in order to
feed the beast, if you will, to get up to the
required number of races that we need for a
particular day.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. So the only way you can not do that is by cutting races. If you moved every one of the races on the fourth day back into the first three, so that your total number of races is what, you know, say it's 40, whatever the number is, you have 40 and you don't want to have 40 because you had this -- in order to get 40 you had to cut a race -- a race with 10 --

MR. O'TOOLE: But we have -- we have trainers that don't participate with us because they can't continue to come for four days.

Electronically signed by Brenda Ginisi (401-014-954-6554)

1

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

variable. You're assuming that it's indifferent to the owner to come any day, but it's not. They -- you have a supply -- you know, a supply question here, which is -- goes along with who's shipping in, who's showing up.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So the essential variable here, is that you think that it's more efficient and more attractive for owners, for people who have the horses and the various people involved, the trainers and so forth, to consolidate. And by consolidating into three days, you're going to have more people being -- so your number of horses is going to go up, right, that's what you're saying. People -more people are going to be willing to race?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Okay. so, is your commitment to pretty much maintain the same number of races; is that what you're saying?

MR. O'TOOLE: Correct.

MR. O'TOOLE: We will race -- we will race every horse that's entered, as long as they fit the conditions and the classes and the state requirements and everything. We have not left a horse on the table this meet, unless the horse had either state requirements that weren't being met or they weren't qualified, things like that.

But, you know, we can race every day. We have 45 horses in the box today for Tuesday. If we go with our seven-race minimum, that's all six horse fields. And then the competition suffers, because what happens is those -- these horses there might be four in one class and seven in another class, so my racing secretary will have to recreate the wheel and try to figure out how we can get those four horses in with the other horses that'd be a competitive race. It's a very difficult puzzle to put together, and he's done a great job doing it.

But all's we're trying to do -- and I don't understand, really -- it frustrates me the reluctance on the part of horsemen to not accept a schedule that they can fill, that they can fill. They're not filling our races

right now. They're not.

Our race average is 7.38. The majority of our races are seven horse fields or less. We can go nine across on our gate. For gimmick wagers and guaranteed pools and things like that, we need to have nine, love to have 10. It creates a lot of excitement.

And we guaranteed pools this year not knowing if we were going to have horses to fill those races. And that was -- I was antsy a couple times, when we were getting close to having to go to post, when the pools didn't meet the 10,000 or 20,000 guarantee that we put on the line. We guaranteed those pools. So those are some of the -- those are some of the things that make it difficult.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I ask a question. And I'm looking forward -- yeah, I'm looking forward to Mr. McHugh, who also seems to be looking for toward to saying and answer some of these questions. But on your Exhibit D you talk about --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is Plainridge Exhibit D?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. You

presented total number of breeding data.

That's nationally, right?

MR. O'TOOLE: Yes. That's provided

by the United States Trotting Association.

That's the total number of foals produced each

year, the right-hand column. The ones that, you know, are on the ground living, ready to be trained.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. But there's also been money to the Racehorse Development Fund to breeders.

MR. O'TOOLE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And the idea, while -- all along, has been that they will be increasing the Mass bred, which will give us at least, you know, some supply nearby and therefore -- you know, more -- increase the field size, eventually.

MR. O'TOOLE: Right.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I don't know how soon, but eventually. What can we talk about in terms of -- you know, these numbers are interesting, but I'm more interested in

the Massachusetts numbers, as it relates to this discussion.

MR. O'TOOLE: So the Massachusetts breeding program is a great story. They almost doubled their size of mares bred in 2017 to 111. So that'll produce 50 more -- approximately, 50 more foals this -- this year -- next year, than it did in the past. But 50 horses is not going to -- is not going to do it. And they're not going to affect this year's schedule or the following year's schedule. They were just -- the mares were just bred. The foals are being raised now. Then they go into training, they race as two-year-olds and three-year-olds. Those are --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's lagging, in other words?

MR. O'TOOLE: That lags. As pointed out in the horsemen's exhibit, the enormous number of horses that we're going to go through this year to do this 125-day meet, you know, the extra 50 horses that the breeding program produces is great. Their races have

been good this year. We just got done with the finals last Monday. But it's not going to fill the void that the national numbers are leaving. It's -- the national numbers are staggering going the other way.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Shall we switch -COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah, let's
switch.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: You're right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. We may be back and forth, but let's give Mr. McHugh a chance to give his presentation.

MR. MCHUGH: My name is Bob McHugh, and I'm president of the HHANE. I just want to start by saying I'm representing the horsemen and women, who race and work as partners with Plainridge Racetrack and Casino, regarding the end of 2018 live racing schedule.

Before I speak to the metrics of number of days requested by Plainville gaming development, I'd like to draw the attention of the Commission to Chapter 23K, Section 24 for the Mass General Laws. It clearly states --

requires a licensee to hold 20 -- 125 days. Section 24 clearly states that, if a licensee does not hold 125 days of live racing, within three years of receiving the gaming license, the Commission shall, doesn't say may, it says shall suspend the gaming license. I would argue that this is a clear directive as to the importance that has been placed on the nonnegotiable requirement to maintain 125-day racing schedule.

And then, lastly in Section 24C, the adjustment after three years is solely in contemplation of increasing from 125 days of live racing is completely inconsistent to think that in A and B there would be such a clear directive and mandate with a casino license suspension as the -- as a penalty, only to turn around and an abandonment of this legislature priority after three years.

Doesn't make any sense. Mr. Corey's in attendance, in back of me here, to respond to any questions regarding the statute.

Now, if the Commission decides, notwithstanding this analysis to consider the

2.1

adjusting of required (inaudible) days, we look to the three metrics. The three metrics of fields, demand and racing performance. I know it's in your exhibits, but I'd like to just summarize them now.

Regarding fields, even while the number of race dates and the number of races has increased 50 percent since 2014, field size has grown, approximately, 55 percent since 2003 to 2014, and is up 2 percent from 2016 to 2017. These numbers show that the horse population has grown faster, not a lot, but faster than the increase in dates with racing. This shows that the racing is on the upswing and has resulted in out-of-state horses, men and women, coming to the Commonwealth, to upgrade their stock and buy horses in Massachusetts.

Again, fields. The -- we mentioned the upturn. The upward trend of the increasing horse population is evidenced by the registrations of mares for breeding. In 2014, it was 44. It's 111 in 2017.

150-percent increase. We would expect this

trend to continue because the success story of harness racing. We really think it's going to continue to grow.

Regarding demand, the live handle, live product has increased substantially. The number of race days increased 56 percent from 2014 to '17, the total handle increased by over 200 percent during the same period. This clearly shows that the demand for the racing product is growing every year.

We did note that the average -- that the -- wagering the Plainridge product has increased 27 percent, while the national average decreased by about five -- almost 5 percent. The number of race days and races increased substantially from 2015 to '17. While the number of race days increased by 19 percent, the number of races increased by more than 26 percent.

This is clear evidence that, even though the mandated race days increased in the past three years, there were more than enough horses to race in these races. As noted above, even with the number of race days

2.1

1 increasing, field size has increased.

The number of claims, I know that -that's gone up from '17 -- 2016 to 31 claims
this year, a hundred percent increase. It
doesn't -- I know it doesn't add horses, but
it does show there's a demand, that people
want to buy horses and race. I think that's a
very positive sign.

I know Mr. O'Toole went back to 2003, but, I mean, that's -- we're looking since the start of the gaming statute. We're just showing that -- since we got the Racehorse Development Fund. I can go back to 1998 and probably show it was less then. So I don't know about this 2003 date. I'm looking since the statute started.

The number of -- United States

Trotting Association by owners' participation

port. Now, he corrected my numbers, but I

hope you agree, there's still a very good

growth. Talk to Exhibit 3. I am going to

talk to the USTA. Commissioner, I apologize

in adding up those numbers, but I -- we called

the USTA for that information, and I accept

the numbers as is. But I hope you agree that it still shows a substantial increase. And, again, the horse participation report, we're getting more horses that race at Plainridge. It was two -- 900 2'15, and 900 -- I should say, 627 in 2015, 900 2016 and 930 to date in 2015, or a 50-percent increase.

Racing performance. I know Steve says it was misplaced, but we're looking at quality of horses. I think this is a wow factor. The number of records we set clearly shows that better and faster horses are coming to Plainridge.

Yeah. I attribute a little bit to the -- to the great maintenance that

Mr. O'Toole and his staff have taken care of the track. But since -- there's about three more track records since this. There's 21 track records. Freehold Raceway, another

Penn-owned game property, has only had three in the past three years. I don't know -- if you look at those three metrics, I don't know how you conclude -- conclude by anything that we're moving up, that we're improving, that

2.1

1 Plainridge is improving.

So I want to say, that the metrics clearly support keeping the racing days as is. In fact, if any change would be based, and we're not -- I'm not recommending it now, we didn't recommend it, the number of days should increase. There was not one single metric to show that there should be a reduction in race days.

This year, 2017, has proven to be the most successful year since Plainridge Park has opened. If there's any change at all, Mr. O'Toole has mentioned Friday's a weekday. Believe me, we would love if they gave us a weekend day. It would help us in our advertising. It would -- we could get other people to attend who don't work -- you know, who work, I should say, who have some leisure time. We would love a weekend day.

And we're also pleased to see, in your packet, that you were sent a letter by the selectmen in the Town of Plainville, approving, you know -- you know, disapproving Plainridge application and desiring for us to

race 125 days. The town realized the economic impact. When trailers come into town, people buy food, people -- you know, people participate in a lot of information, so a lot of things in the town.

And I want to say, you know, I know Steve said he was a horseman one time so he gets it. But I can tell you, there's not one horseman -- the word I hear all the time is no one wants to lose days. It's so important to keep this industry stable. The long --

I can tell you, horsemen and women in this state, and even around the country, are still unsure as to the stability of this industry in Massachusetts. And a reduction of a hundred days will create a lot of questions.

We must continue the positive direction and send the right message to breeders, owners and trainers, that harness racing is on the live and its upward trend will continue.

I would ask each of you, if you wanted to buy a -- if you were interested in breeding a horse, if you were an owner, if you

were a trainer, if you heard that Plainridge reduced the number of days from 125 to 100, what am I telling you? What is the message we would be giving to you? That is my concern as representing these horsemen.

And so I said, any reduction in the number of days would have a chilling effect on the horsemen and women who now race with Plainridge, as well as anyone. And I've talked to people contemplating to coming this state. You know, I can't promise what's going to happen, but I really believe that we could get people opening a training center, you know, buying -- I know that. I know the Town of Plainville asked me that, about the farms. There's a definite chance we can get more people, you know, having a training center. We need that. Land is tough to get around here. There's only 141 stalls at Plainridge.

Now, Penn Gaming, we believe, has an obligation to the citizens of the Commonwealth, who granted them the only Class 2 gaming license, and to the men and women, to continue to race a minimum of 120 days and

beyond. And that was my script.

But I want to say, the horsemen and women want to work with Plainridge. We want to work with you guys. I think we've shown that. We know that working together as a team is the best way for every -- everyone to maximize the income for the Commonwealth.

In that regard, I know -- I know

Steve just mentioned that -- the

disappointment, the number of Massachusetts

owners has gone down. We asked for a bonus

program. We asked to give a bonus to Mass

owners, Mass-owned and bred. That was

declined.

We were trying to get an incentive, which would advertise for people from -- live in Massachusetts to buy a horse. In his proposal, he said that we had not lept to our agreement to come up with adequate entries.

Well, in some ways, I feel we've been asked to drive the bus but not touch the steering wheel. You know, some of the input we've given to the condition sheet has not been accepted. And we would like to have -- if

we're going to be responsible for adequate entries, we need some more input.

I talked to Alex just three weeks ago about a couple rules promulgated accepted by the USTA, specifically, a horse whose race had -- once they bet in a parimutuel race they have 60 days before they have to race again. I understand Mr. O'Toole's rationale, but he wants -- Plainridge wants to have that 30-day rule, says for his protection or the bettor. I understand that rationale. But that's -- that prohibits adequate entries.

Another issue was trotting hobbles. I believe the USTA has adopted a rule to say, if you a change of equipment you don't have a qualify -- qualify means a practice race or nonparimutuel betting race. Plainridge has decided not to adopt that rule. Again, that -- small, but it has an impact on entries.

So, I mean, only thing that bothered me, when I read their rebuttal to you is that, we're -- we're responsible for adequate entries, but we don't have the -- we're in the

back of bus. We can't steer the bus. And so, we would like to have additional input into that.

And -- and -- and I want to say just one other thing, we mentioned three days. We have some big stables here, that race here.

I'll tell you right now, a couple people have told me they'd have to cut their stable, because they -- they have a big stable and if they -- over four days they can race each horse. When you condense it into three days, they are going to have trouble bringing all their horses in in three-day meet. Help in racing that many in one day. It doesn't affect a lot, but it does affect big stables. So that's my --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I have a couple of questions. Mostly, on trying to answer the first question that you pose, which is what is our decision point here?

Mr. McHugh, in your -- in your read of the statute on Section C, Section 24, you assume that the Commission may only increase the amount of races, race days?

1 MR. MCHUGH: Yeah, that was our 2 legal -- I mean, I'll have to ask Mr. Corey, 3 but that was our legal interpretation of that 4 those -- that the statute required a minimum 5 of 125 days. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: For the third 7 year -- from Section 24. 8 MR. MCHUGH: Right. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Section 24 is 10 very clear --11 MR. MCHUGH: Right. 12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- that it 13 stipulates year number one, year number two and year number three in a particular number 14 15 of race days -- race dates, number of race 16 dates, but Section 3 says that the Commission 17 may adjust. If it was only going to be an 18 increase, couldn't the legislature have said 19 may only increase the number of dates, based 20 on field size and everything else? 21 MR. COREY: Commissioner, we would 22 argue that under 24 --23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think, 24 Mr. Corey, please come forward into the

1 microphone.

MR. COREY: Thank you, Commissioner. We would argue that you have to read the section in its totality. And when you read 24A, Subsection 3, in the third and subsequent calendar years of operation, a gaming licensee shall hold 125 days. The responsibility is to build up to 125 days and to remain at 125 days.

That's supported in B with the thought that, if you don't reach 125 days racing days within that three-year period, your license will be suspended. That's an incredibly harsh penalty, where there's absolutely no flexibility by the Commission to -- you know, with a lesser penalty, the license is suspended, so the whole operation shuts down. So there's a clear mandate that, that 125-day level be reached and maintained.

Moreover, in C, the argument we believe is clear, since this is the first time that the expression "gaming establishment," prior to that the words used are licensee, that three years of operation of the gaming

1 establishment refers to when Plainridge casino 2 got its operating license, which was 3 June 24, 2015, the three-year period has not 4 yet been --5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I want to take 6

those issues separately.

MR. COREY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Because I also read your brief. But you contend that, because of Subsection 3, you know, A3, where it says "the third and subsequent calendar years of operation shall hold 125 days," that Subsection C can only -- the adjustment can only be up?

> MR. COREY: Correct. Yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Why wouldn't they say increase, as opposed to adjust, on Subsection C?

MR. COREY: I think it's a lack of clarity in that section.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Which brings us to the disagreement. But why wouldn't there be any need to look at racing days or fields, or demand, or racing performance, if

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

it was always meant to be a minimum of 125 days?

MR. COREY: We think the threshold has been set at 125, and those would be the factors that they would want you to look at, if the contemplation was to increase it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Given your reading of this, what does Section C add; why did you have to have Section C, if all is required is 125 or more?

MR. COREY: I think just if -- if the thought was to revisit it with an eye towards increasing it to a higher level.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But it already says that. A gaming -- B says, "A gaming licensee may increase the number of lifing (phonetically) days, if the licensee is holding 25." So they've already been authorized to increase, so what does C add?

MR. COREY: The ability of the parties to approach the Commission to increase it. Candidly, the situation that we're confronted with here, where the inability of the parties to the agreement, the horsemen and

the track, to agree as to where the future of the race -- live racing is going and putting the Commission in the role of arbiters, where the inability of the horsemen to have the appropriate role of involvement with the number of live racing days. That's why -- that's, fundamentally, why we're here.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I ask, also, traditionally, the legislature set the number of race days, but it was at least a tradition that there was a minimum number of race days per day, correct; those were your opening remarks?

MS. LIGHTBOWN: Right. Seven was the minimum number of races to be considered --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Seven was the minimum number. So that way, if there was always a seven minium, the legislation could just change the number of race days and assumes that the number of total of races was just a formula put in -- multiplied times seven because that's the minimum.

What about the argument that if you

2.1

increase days -- races -- number of races within one day, leaves you in a similar situation with a total number of races? If you have -- which we're all interested in, by the way. The num -- as I understand it, if there's more races, there's more betting public that increases handle in that one day that can attract -- you know, brings more revenues to the Commonwealth.

MR. COREY: As Bob mentioned, though, you decrease the opportunity for the larger stables to get their horses into the races. So you actually cut back on the ability for people, who have more horses, to get their horses into their races on a three-day week versus a four-day week.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I don't understand that argument. How do you call it opportunity? Just -- you could call on the three other days.

MR. MCHUGH: If you had 20 -- if you had -- let me even it out. If you had -- if you had 20 horses, you'd have to race five -- you could race five on each day, five, 10, on

They don't

the four-calendar days. What the -- because of help and a lot of -- those big stables have told me, they can't -- they can't get the help and consolidate those horses into three days. It puts too much stress on bringing them all down and racing in that day.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:

want to hire an extra person, in other words?

MR. MCHUGH: Well, it's hard to get

people. And it just -- if you're a trainer it

too much back -- it's a seven-horse paddock.

So you also got the issue of seven-horse

paddock, the eighth, ninth, 10th. I think

with the number ship installs and coming back

it out, it's a very stressful process that

these grooms to --

MR. COREY: Plainridge doesn't have the space to handle the load.

MR. MCHUGH: They can do it, but it's very stressful. And it makes -- just like your workload, you know. I'll compare it to your work week. You can only get so much done in a day. You can only do so much in a day and now your asking someone -- two days

may be even better, but now you have 10 horses a day. It's just -- I've been told -- I'm the owner. Steve has more of a -- has been a trainer and driver. But I've told by a couple they would have to cut their stable. They just can't do it. And this -- here we go. Then we'll be back next year and say we want 80 days because people -- the big stables would have to cut.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: On that note, so it would be equivalent of someone like me working 40 hour -- 40 hours in four days, as opposed to eight-hour days in five days?

MR. MCHUGH: Yeah. Except it's four to three. I'd rather -- I'd say you'd work 40 hours in four days and now you work three days. That's a better -- that'd -- that's tougher.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. I get the argument that it stresses the operations --

MR. MCHUGH: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But how is that detrimental, and I don't know that you

used these words, but why is that not acceptable to the horsemen to have the same number of races in total, assuming that it's now in less days? And one argument is the stress that it puts in the operations. I get that. Is that the only one?

MR. MCHUGH: The general -- I'm talking about the horsemen now. Whether it's me or not, general horsemen, I've heard, is -- I mean, let's take Plainridge Casino, they make -- most of their money from the slot parlor. The feeling is, and I think it's happened around the country, when tracks reduce race days, you don't get 'em back. Every track around -- every track around the country that's reduced days I, can't say for sure, but you don't get them back.

And, again, it's so important I leave you with this, we -- I have a friend of mine who bought -- I'm trying to get him (inaudible) about horses with me. What is the message? What is the message --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But you see, you're not answering the question that I have,

1 which is -- which is, do you really care about 2 race days --3 MR. MCHUGH: Yes. 4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- or the 5 number of races? Because number of races in 6 total, which is the argument that Plainridge 7 makes, could conceivably leave you, you know, 8 the same. 9 It could conceivably. MR. MCHUGH: 10 But, again, back to the big stables. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 11 That's -that's one factor. 12 13 MR. MCHUGH: That's one factor. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I understand. 14 15 I want to understand any others, if there's 16 any others. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. The economics of it. 18 19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The economics. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there some 21 reason why it's not in the economic -- passing 22 this issue of stress on the system, we'll just 23 set that aside, passing that issue from an 24 economic standpoint for your membership, is

1 it -- how is it worse, to have the same number 2 of race in three days than in four days? 3 MR. COREY: Because the message it 4 sends to the public --5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. 6 it's not a matter of economics. So from a 7 matter of your own economics, what you're concerned about --8 MR. MCHUGH: 9 Well --10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let me just finish what I'm hearing you guys say. I'm hearing 11 12 two arguments. One is, there's some sense of 13 momentum and so forth that you'd like to keep 14 going, you think it gives a bad message, if 15 you cut the racing days, and there is some 16 factor for some stables, at least arguably,

> MR. MCHUGH: Yeah --

days is an issue.

MR. COREY: No --No.

that operating all of their horses in three

CHAIRMAN CROSBY:

MR. COREY: -- Commissioner.

That the --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So what else?

What's the economic difference to you guys?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. COREY: Because there's a five-year investment cycle that you need to make, if you're going to decide to bring a horse, and to race a horse in Massachusetts.

The whole idea behind the Racehorse Development Fund and the commitment to live racing, as we've seen in the discussion with thoroughbred racing, is -- is to enhance, support and to encourage people to make the required investment in racing.

And if you cut 20 percent, 25 days from the harness race schedule -- they're doing wonderful things down in Plainridge.

And the thought is, to send the message to people who want to bring horses and increase and breed horses in Massachusetts, we're not there yet.

But if you look -- you look at the number of mares bred in Massachusetts, if you look at the handle, if you look at the appropriate statistics, they're all very encouraging, they're heading in the right direction. But if you cut the number of days, it sends the wrong message.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I see that argument, if -- if you've cut races. But if you're not cutting races, I don't know how you don't go your membership and say, look, you have the same amount of races. I don't -- I don't see the argument. I do see the argument, if you cut races.

MR. MCHUGH: Right. But it's also, Commissioner Cameron, you mentioned at a public hearing about protecting the local person. Again, PGI has control over the condition sheet. If they don't fill, we have to give a certain of money, those purses are going to go up. I mean, we are concerned about protecting the local horsemen.

I have to say, those Fridays, there are mostly races written for the local horsemen, the guys that have just been here for years. They have to move on, I understand, at some point and get better quality horses.

But if -- if the number of races -- and I'm not -- if the number of races do not fill, say they don't fill it's back to 10,

that means the purses have -- the purses will go up and that's going, to me, to attract people coming in, shipping in and leaving, and some of the local horsemen have supported Plainridge over the years, maybe --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But here's something I don't understand, in this chart of the owner participation, the horse -- the number of race days went up by, what, 10, from 16 to 17?

MR. MCHUGH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: From 115 to 125.

What that did was attract 75 more horses from out of state and one less horse from Massachusetts. So what you're doing -- what you're doing by increasing racing days is increasing more out -- more opportunities for out of state horse to come to Massachusetts. The number of Massachusetts horses went down, even though the racing days went up.

MR. MCHUGH: We talking about the owners?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah.

MR. MCHUGH: Well, that's why --

1 that's why --2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's the data 3 that you gave us. 4 MR. MCHUGH: Right. That's why, Chairman Crosby, we tried -- we wanted to put 5 6 something on the condition sheet to encourage 7 Mass ownership, to give bonuses, to encourage 8 people from Massachusetts to buy horses. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. But 10 that's -- that's a whole different issue. 11 mean, that's not --12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, that is 13 authority that we don't have. This condition 14 sheet that you presented for the -- that I've 15 heard for the first time, some of the rules 16 that -- that impact entries, I find 17 fascinating, but that's something that we, 18 clearly, don't have the authority to approve 19 or try to arbitrate. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. So I think 21 we should leave that one aside. 22 MR. MCHUGH: Okay. 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I just -- I find 24 these -- both of these issues really

perplexing, and I want to come back to the -what does the statutes say. But I can't -- I
don't know how much of this stress on big
stables is a factor. I don't know how to
measure that. I don't know how big a deal
that is so I can't weigh that one very well.

This momentum thing is all a matter of what you say. Just because you're now saying it's going to create a bad sense out there, well, it shouldn't. You can just say -- make it differently. Work -- do a promotional campaign that says we're upping the number of races, or we're upping the number of horses or whatever.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: There's more money coming from the Racehorse Development Fund.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, right, there's more money coming in. And since the only consequence that we can see, based on your data, is that more days are giving more opportunity for out-of-state owner,s, rather than in-state owners, I don't -- and our job is to protect Massachusetts owners, among

others, I don't see the nexus between the interests of your membership and more days, other than this etherial momentum thing, which I think is a self-fulfilling prophecy. If you go around and tell everybody it's going to be a bummer, if we go from 125 to 100 maybe it will be. But if you're a part of -- if you're a part of strategy to say Massachusetts is on the rise and here's how we're doing it, then it doesn't have to be a negative to the momentum.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I'd like to did Dr. Lightbown and maybe Mr. O'Toole about the stress. Is there a -- create a situation where it is difficult, A, for the larger -- the larger -- larger farms and owners and/or our own staff, is that a problem with, say, upping the number of races per day?

MS. LIGHTBOWN: So it'll probably vary for each individual trainer and owner.

You know, some owners and trainers it'll be a benefit. You know, maybe they're bringing down three horses on Mondays, and now they -- maybe they can bring five. And they'll save a

trip, they'll save the gas and it'll be a benefit for them.

Maybe, like Mr. McHugh said, maybe there's going to be some that are already bringing down as many as they can bring and so they're not going to be able to bring extras. Like Commissioner Zuniga said, do you hire extra help or -- you know. So it'll -- it'll vary a little bit on that.

On our help, I did talk to Executive Director Bedrosian when this was brought up, most of our staff is seasonal, since racing is seasonal, and they're on a -- basically, on a day rate. It's -- per state it's been hourly rate, but it -- basically they're paid for performance.

And so, we've had very brief, initial discussions on how we might have to look at how these people are compensated, if now they're doing the work of four days in three days, to be fair.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I see. If they're paid hourly, then they just work more hours per day, as opposed to an extra day?

MS. LIGHTBOWN: Well, that's what would happen. If they were adding extra races, you know, they'll -- instead of getting the fourth day of pay, now they'll be out that day of pay and they'll be asked to do more work over a longer period of time on the days they're working. But that's something that, you know, we would address on our end.

Mr. O'Toole has said that most of his racing staff is on salary and he doesn't feel it's going to affect them.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: How does -CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Wait. I think you
were going to answer Commissioner Cameron's
question.

MR. O'TOOLE: As far as the stress, we don't have too many 20-horse stables, first of all. There are a few. And, usually, in a 20-horse stable, not all horses are racing at the same time.

But we raced 80 days in 2013 and before. We raced 80 days in 2014. I never heard this stress argument when we raced 80 days three days a week. Back then, we raced

two days a week to start for a couple of weeks, and we ended the season, usually going three days a week. And this is the first time I've heard the stress factor, as far as racing. It's a hectic scene. I've done it myself, you know, when I was racing a stable and you bite offer what you can chew. And most of the guys do, as far as -- as far as I can see, yeah.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Does

Plainridge -- I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Does

Plainridge -- again, trying to estimate this stress. But, I mean, does Plainridge have space, adequate facilities if you had, you know, to accommodate people, might bring down more horses than they had anticipated, if you're short a number of days?

MR. O'TOOLE: So in the 80-day seasons and the 100-day seasons prior to 2014, we had no ship-in barn and we raced 14 races a day. We flipped the paddock one time. It is

1 a seven-race paddock, as Mr. McHugh said. 2 Now, we have a ship-in barn to house the 3 horses when they're not in the paddock. 4 there's -- you have to flip them, yeah. And 5 it's not uncommon. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What's the 7 term, Mr. O'Toole ship and what? MR. O'TOOLE: Ship in. 8 So the 9 horses come in, they have a place to go, to 10 rest, relax before they --11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You were talking 12 about flip -- you said, "flipping the 13 paddock." What does that mean? MR. O'TOOLE: Similar to a 14 15 restaurant, flipping tables. 16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. Got to 17 reuse them. 18 MR. O'TOOLE: So you can have seven 19 races, after the first race is over they 20 leave, and then in a -- 20 minutes or so the 21 eighth race comes in and takes that. 22 that's not uncommon practice in paddocks. 23 know, thoroughbreds race from a one-race 24 paddock.

MR. COREY: I've been advised that that's no statutory requirement for the number of races and that -- more than seven. So even if you cut the number of days, they would have

no obligation to race more than seven races.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, they are now, for starters. But we're getting -- we're getting a commitment from them, if we were to decide. It's clear that the -- that what we're hearing is there is going to be, for all intents and purposes, the same number of races. Give or take, not exactly.

But as a practical matter, the whole purpose here is to have the same number of races. And I think the Commission -- if what's what we supported, I think the Commission would not be very happy with Plainridge and would be welcomed to have you

I want to go back to the question -- unless I'm interrupting somebody.

back, if that didn't happen.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I want to go back to this threshold question, which is, what

does the statute say? And we've had this experience before, this was a complicated statute, and I think this is the place where the language is unclear. But it is your understanding that, if Plainridge wanted to increase the number of races next year, that they could do so on their own hook, have nothing to do with us?

MR. COREY: No. I think that the statute requires -- the continuation of 125 racing days. And that, if they wanted to increase it above 125 racing days under Section 24C, that it would require consultation with the Gaming Commission and between the parties.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So that means that the sentence B, the first sentence, "The gaming licensee may increase the number of license racing days, if they're already holding the minimum of 125," is essentially meaningless?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$ COREY: No. That says within three years.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. Well, this

1 is three years. Next year would be the fourth 2 year. 3 I don't agree. MR. COREY: 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. Then, 5 what about the year after that? 6 MR. COREY: Perhaps. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. So you 8 think that B says that increases --9 reconciling the ramp-up period, once your 10 outside the ramp-up period, whichever it is, 11 you're saying that Section B says that 12 Plainridge can increase racing days on its 13 own, period? MR. COREY: Within three years of 14 15 receiving the license. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 16 Yes. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: After three years? 18 MR. COREY: For the first three 19 years. 20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But it No. 21 starts --22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: "A gaming licensee 23 may increase the number of live racing days, 24 if the gaming licensee is holding a minimum of

1 125 racing days within three years of " -- so 2 if, within three years, you get to 125 you can 3 increase it. 4 MR. COREY: For those three years. MR. MCHUGH: Right. 5 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. So if 7 that's -- that's not what it says to me. But 8 anyway, so what three says -- so three --9 sorry. Section C is really the operative 10 section with respect to -- from changing from 125. So --11 12 MR. COREY: However, Commissioner, 13 after three years of operation of the gaming establishment. 14 15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We're going to 16 get to that one. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, that's a 18 different --19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We're going to 20 get to that one. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There's two 22 different issues. I mean --23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Imagine that 24 it's four years now.

	Page 143
1	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. Imagine
2	that it's four years.
3	MR. COREY: It's 2019.
4	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, right.
5	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.
6	MR. COREY: Yes. Thank you.
7	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What about C?
8	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So C if that's
9	the case, if it's locked in your view it's
10	locked into 125, unless the Commission changes
11	it, past postramp-up period, then the word
12	adjust becomes pretty meaningful. Why did
13	they say "adjust"
14	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And not
15	increase.
16	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: and not
17	increase?
18	MR. COREY: Because I think, for the
19	first time, it contemplates a consultation
20	with the parties.
21	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's not
22	mutually exclusive.
23	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No. It doesn't
24	have anything to do with

1

2

3

4

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We're having the consultation, which is great, but what about the question of adjust versus increase?

> MR. COREY: I can't speak to that.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. Well. that's what we're trying to wrestle with. Ι mean, it's -- so I have a question for counsel. Section A, little three, 3I, is absolutely foursquare that it shall be 125 racing days for the third and subsequent That's a little bit like the years, flat out. one in the old in the gaming employee -service employee that says there shall be a -you know, a background check in effect for gaming service employees. And then, there were subsequent sections which made it look like, well, I don't think those background checks really apply to gaming. How do -- how do we reconcile that foursquare statement

MS. BLUE: So I think, as the Commission has grappled with racing issues

Gaming Commission can adjust them?

about 125 five with C, which says, in effect,

notwithstanding what I just said up above, the

before, you know, racing is governed by a multitude of statutes that have different rules for different breeds. And so, you have to read the gaming amendments, basically, in conjunction with what 128A and 128C provides. You also have to think about the fact that the legislature knew that 128A and 128C were there. So things like, you have to race a hundred days in order to simulcast, have to be read in conjunction with 24.

What we know, from the legislature's past history, was that every year the stakeholders went back to the legislature and asked for a change in the days. So the way I look at 24C, is that the legislature understands that there might be some kind of a change. And as they did in 2014, when they made the change and they gave the discretion to the Commission to ultimately work with the parties and come to a number of days, they put that in this section so that you could look at the number of days and think about safety issues, field size.

I mean, I think the legislature

increased number of racing days going forward.

But I think they understood that that might not necessarily work. And the best place for that decision to be made, and the consultation as we're having now, would be in front of the Commission to make that decision. So I see 24 as acknowledging that there may be some reasons why 125 days don't work.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Can I ask
Mr. McHugh, I clearly remember, in 2015, after
racing -- after racing 80 days in 2014, the
horsemen were very much in favor of starting
that clock and racing 105 days in 2015. I
know you weren't the president then, but you
were a member, you were a horseman then; do
you recall that?

MR. MCHUGH: I can't -- in favor of racing 105?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, in other words, yes. So in 2015, the Commission made the decision -- you know, that was the beginning of the calendar year to start, even

1 though the casino itself wasn't open, so we, 2 in fact --3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Approved the 4 racing application? 5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, 105 6 days. And the horsemen, they were out in 7 force at that hearing in agreement, in support of starting the clock and racing 105 days in 8 9 2015. 10 MR. MCHUGH: Well, my understanding, Commissioner Cameron is that --11 12 MR. COREY: Don't speculate. 13 MR. MCHUGH: Okay. Is -- yeah. Is 14 -- okay. 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I asked 16 Mr. McHugh a question. This is not a legal proceeding, Mr. Corey. I'd like to him to 17 18 answer. 19 MR. COREY: Thank you, Commissioner. 20 Yeah, yeah. Well, I do MR. MCHUGH: 21 think that that agreement was signed and 22 people just so happy, they're worried that 23 there would be no racing at all. And I do 24 remember from Mike Papale, the previous

president, that there was an anticipation that from 80 to 105 was a big jump and that it would take time going forward. It takes time to get more -- to get new owners, more horses. So 80 to 105, to 115, 125, it was a logical progression.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, I guess what I'm saying is, I never heard -- this isn't the first year of the gaming establishment. We shouldn't start we should have 80 days instead of a 105. My only point is, we're hearing that now, after three years. We never heard that argument three years ago, when we started it and the room was full of horsemen in support of the additional racing.

This is a good-news story, obviously. And it's just a question of how we solve this one issue, which is racing days, at this point. So I just -- I guess I'm just finding this piece, knowing the past and being involved personally over the last three and four years, starting that clock at the time we did was very much -- the horsemen were very much supportive of that.

1 MR. MCHUGH: Right. 2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. 3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I was going to 4 ask that question from a different 5 perspective. But it's -- it's very helpful, 6 the way you've framed it. Your argument seems to be relative to when the clock started 7 ticking, that from April of 2015 --8 9 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: '15. 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 2015 to June of 2015, when the gaming establishment first 11 12 opened, those days were for free, were gratis, 13 because those were not -- those didn't count, in your opinion? 14 What the -- excuse me. 15 MR. MCHUGH: 16 The --17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: If the clock started -- if the statute stipulates the 18 19 minimums for the next three years, that's 20 every clear --21 MR. MCHUGH: Right. 22 105, 115 and COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 23 125, there's a disagreement -- you argue that 24 the clock started ticking when the gaming

establishment opened in June 27 of 2015. But
the calendar year had already started,
which -- which is Commissioner Cameron's
question. Back in November of the prior year,
you were in support of the Plainridge
application for 105 days for that calendar
year. If the clock only started ticking in
June, what about all those days between April
and June, were those just free days, race
days?

MR. MCHUGH: I guess my -- I mean,
I'm not sure if I totally understand your
question. But when we developed the three
metrics, it was based on to supporting the 125
days. I didn't, you know, I don't --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm trying to take us back to 2015.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think

Commissioner Cameron established the point.

That at the time there was a broad consensus that the clock was starting. This was -- this was the first year 105, next was 115, next

125. Now, there is this argument that this ambiguity about three years of operation of

the gaming establishment neuters all that agreement and there's an additional year.

I think, you know, I remember the same conversations. Personally, the idea that the use of the word gaming establishment mandates a fourth year in effect, I find unacceptable. I think the argument about whether or not we have the authority to increase is complicated, because the language just is simply incompatible. There are places where it's incompatible.

But bottom line, it's not logical to me that they were only talking about the possibility of increasing. You know, as I try to reason my way through this, I think they were -- they intended to give us -- and I have talked with them about this -- not this specific issue, but in general, about the wish to let the determination of racing days go to the -- to the Gaming Commission. I know this is what they have been thinking about a lot.

So I end up thinking, yes, the clock has run. We've done the three-day -- three-year ramp-up, and yes, we do have the

authority to go lower than 125 than if we thick the conditions warrant that.

What I'm still wrestling with is whether or not I think we should go lower than 125. And I think that's a -- that's a really close call. And I guess as a -- sort of a summary, it's a -- it's really close call. And because, not notwithstanding the fact that the racing days are going up, the field size is going up, the races per day are going up, they're going up slowly but they're going up, I find it very troubling that the Massachusetts horses are not benefiting by the increase in racing days. That's what we're about here.

Now, I don't want to -- doesn't make me feel to bring more race days for guys from Maine, who were the ones that benefited the most. They increased the most, the Maine owners. So I'm very -- but if we're in consensus, I'd like to narrow us down, that we're talking now about the remaining issue, which is, do we agree or not with the wish to reduce from 125 to a hundred, and focus the

Page 153

1 rest of our energy of trying to resolve that? 2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I agree, 3 Mr. Chair, they have met their three-year 4 commitment, and I agree that we have the 5 authority -- I agree with your analysis, that 6 we have the authority to now opine on race 7 days. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I agree. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I want to sort of --11 12 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Can I 13 just --14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes, please. 15 Yeah. 16 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Just ask a 17 question of Director Lightbown. Do I 18 understand that having reviewed our general 19 counsel's memorandum on what the statute 20 means, that you have reviewed these contending 21 positions and have concluded that upon a 22 consideration of the issues relating to field, 23 demand and racing performance, that you're 24 recommending to us that we should accept the

Plainridge proposal that Mr. O'Toole has addressed today?

MS. LIGHTBOWN: No. I specifically left that out of memo as to the number of days. I've discussed it with Executive Director and Counsel Blue, and that is clearly under your decision to make.

Basically, I do concur with

Catherine's memo abut the number of -- the

year and when it started. At every -- one of

our licensing hearings, it's either been in

the memo that has been written up --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, we're past that one. We're past that one. But I think Commissioner MacDonald's asking, what's your opinion on these -- this is a matter of judgment calls on these issues.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: So it's a difficult question. I totally understand the track's position, where, if you look at the Fridays in particular, those are not a good card of racing, as far as the number of races go, and as far as the number of horses in those races.

I think we had a -- last week or the

week before, the first race there were a couple of scratches, horses that didn't run, and we were down to, like, a four-horse field, and the bettors don't want to bet on that.

And, you know, that's just a fact.

And anytime you have a racing card, you have to assume that there are going to be a few scratches. You know, horses that, for whatever reason, aren't going to be ready.

They were ready at the time of entry. By the time the races come up, for whatever reason, they're not racing.

But on the other hand, I also -- it is a very good story that we have to tell on how the -- you know, things have been improving. The two parties got to the point, I believe, where Plainridge was offering 105 days and the standardbred group was looking at 114.

MR. MCHUGH: 120.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What?

MR. MCHUGH: 120, I think. With

some conditions. 120 with added conditions.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: Yeah. I -- maybe --

Page 156

1 don't know what -- if Steve remembers it being 2 114 or 120. I thought it was down to 114. 3 And like Mr. McHugh was saying, there were 4 some different concessions made. I thought it 5 was very generous of Penn to be offering a 6 three-year agreement with a hundred days, just 7 because it does give some stability. if -- that didn't sway the horsemen. 8 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So they had --10 Plainridge had pledged to not come back next 11 year and reduce again, as they were concerned? 12 MS. LIGHTBOWN: Right. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is that part of 14 your proposal now, not to reduce? 15 MR. O'TOOLE: Yeah. We have no 16 intentions of reducing any further. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But, apparently, 18 at one point you made a commitment to that 19 point. Would you make that commitment now --20 MR. O'TOOLE: Yes. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- as part of 22 this? 23 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: To make it 24 over three year?

MR. O'TOOLE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. So we don't have a strawman out there that you're going to come back next year and come back for another reduction?

MR. O'TOOLE: No. And that's one of our concerns that Bob brought to the table on our very first meeting in late August. That the -- two things. That the season remained the same, and if -- if you reduce days then the horsemen are going to come back and say, well, they reduced days, then it's going to be to 80 and then 50 and -- and I assured him at that time that we had no intention of doing that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, that's good. Okay.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I'm a little confused on this. I read the materials and did my best to understand them. Under recommendation, on the second page of your memo, Director Lightbown, the recommendation is the racing division recommends that the Commission approve the application of

Plainville gaming and redevelopment for live horseracing in 2018. Why -- I thought their proposal is a hundred days.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: Yeah. Maybe I should have clarified that. In the part above that, I mentioned that the groups would be giving their presentations to you on the number of days.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So that wasn't --

MS. LIGHTBOWN: And so, I wasn't including the number of days in my recommendation.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You're not approving -- you're not approving their proposal, is what you're saying?

MS. LIGHTBOWN: I'm leaving that up to you all to decide. If you want my opinion, I think you settle between the 114 and 105 and go with 110. And that gives the -- the racing office the opportunity to look at the horse population over the course of the year.

As Steve has mentioned, the racing secretary's very good at knowing when their

may be, you know, fair racing up in Maine and those people aren't going to be able to come down, and that's going to be a particularly tough week to fill races so maybe they don't race a day that week.

Maybe at the beginning of the meet, you know, look -- when I looked back at the -- what we did this year, it looked like some of the summer months were pretty strong, so maybe you race that extra day in the summer to come up with that amount.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But the hundred -the splitting the baby here doesn't really go
to the issue, which seems to be the motivating
-- the real motivating factor behind the
horsemen's resistance, which is this momentum
argument. You know, I mean, it feels like
it's -- it feels like there's a real passion
for the horsemen, that this is going to be a
bad sign and will destabilize an industry,
which is being restored. And I don't know
whether splitting the baby solves that
problem.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: There's

Page 160

another sign that operates here, which is also a good-news story, but that's -- and that has to do with the field size and all these three different factors that, you know, sort of work against each other, and that is the handle.

If there's an increase in the handle -- and that's also an important part for the economic development of the Commonwealth, you know, we all benefit. And if the claim is that, in order to complete and increase that handle we have to find where there's, you know, better days, and the argument that at least Plainridge makes, is with three you'd be better able to do that, even with fuller cards and the, you know, fuller fields, there would be an increase in handle, which is in the interest of everybody.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. But how does that cut to Director Lightbown's point about 110?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No, no.

That's --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's saying stick with a hundred. You're accepting

Mr. O'Toole's assertion that consolidating in 200, basically, the same number of races in a hundred days is going to increase the handle, right; is that what I heard you say?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Which is a reason for us to do that, because we have an interest in increasing the handle?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes, yes. So it would be only the -- you know, not as much but, you know, a little bit more, or less, I quess.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Mr. Chairman, if I could just say one thing. This has been a long and fruitful discussion. The interesting thing, I think, is just to put as a context is, we're still in this -- racing's still in the semi-purgatory state in the sense that the racing laws are going to expire midway through the year next year.

So to the extent, which I know I can totally understand the horsemen's concern that there's going -- you know, you lose momentum, you know, the legislature has huge decisions

to make next year that I think are going to have a lot more affect on momentum of the racing industry. Not to diminish the decision you will make here. It's a very important decision. But the context in which the industry and the Commission finds itself in is not a vacuum. It's this broader context of what's going to happen, generally, with racing.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

appreciate that point. I think to the point we're trying to address -- and I talked about it before, and I appreciate Mr. McHugh's point, is Massachusetts look like we're stepping off the gas because, whoa, we hit one at 25, let's peel it all back. But on the flip side of that scale, you know, fighting the perception of losing the race days, now you're talking about more races per year, per meet season, you know, we've had a shift in purse allotments via the horseracing committee, simply more opportunities to race, more handle, which is -- you know, as

Commissioner Zuniga said is another economic factor that we're weighing.

I have a question -- I don't want to detour us a little bit, but at the same time if we're going to make a decision on not -- I'm peeling back on the 125 and basing it on the three-cut criteria of field.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Demand and performance.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Demand and performance, you look through the two briefs. And Plainridge has one definition of performance and the horsemen have another definition of performance. And, you know, we're tackling this for the first time. The next time, we may need to review these criteria. It'd be great, if we had set some benchmark as to what we accept as definitions. I'd like to have us, at least, try to figure out if there's a definition of performance that we can agree upon.

I think breaking race records is great, and certainly, probably, a matter of pride for the horsemen. From an industry

perspective, what that translates to, in terms of jobs, in terms of handle, I don't quite know. But I'd almost feel inclined to look at the definition that Plainridge Park has put forward. I mean, again, we're going to evaluate reducing days having some agreement on what we decide performance as a criteria is.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are we talking about going forward, like for next -- having a standard so we can look with --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Well, we got to think about it today, but we're also setting, kind of a -- you know, we're setting a benchmark for how future commissions may deal with the issue of performance.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, one thing that I find very important to consider is this notion that Dr. Lightbown corroborates relative to what appears to be the -- you know, Fridays, the most difficult day, that if you have -- it's one thing to think about average field sizes, but it's the ones that are at four horses that are really

problematic, because then the handle really decreases, if you have only four horses in that race, for whatever reason. There's not enough that showed up, or a couple of them scratched and what have you.

So that's an element that I find -the mind has to migrate to averages. But the
tail ends are what, in my mind, really becomes
to erode, a little bit, the product. If
people who are around and they see that, well,
that's only a field size of four, I'm going to
go concentrate on something different.

MR. MCHUGH: Chairman Crosby, can we also request for a week -- we'd like to request for a weekend day to race, a weekend of Saturday or Sunday?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, that's where we start diving into the whole purse agreement that we've never had -- nobody every contemplated.

MS. BLUE: No. That's not within our --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That's not in our purview.

7 8

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's really a commercial -- yeah, that's not in our purview. All of those conditions are great, as you are negotiate with -- with the track.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And I think the -racing performance with small R and small P,
anybody can define racing performance however
you want. But the brief from Plainridge
defined racing performance pulls the defining
term out of 128C, and defines racing
performance as the conduct of at least seven
race per day, and deems that to be the minimum
acceptable.

So, I mean, I think that we can expand on that definition, but that's clearly a baseline definition. You can add these other factors as to interesting data points, relevant data points. But in terms of the literal use of racing performance, it's pretty explicit. And I think it does make -- it does imply that the performance is not very good. We're barely over the minimum number of acceptable number of horses per race.

MR. MCHUGH: Well --

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Did you want to 2 say something? 3 MR. MCHUGH: Well, seven -- 9.5 --4 yeah, okay. No. No, I'll just --5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm sorry. No. 6 At least -- oh, the conduct of at least seven 7 live races -- oh, okay, no, I'm sorry, I miss -- I was wrong. I was talking about 8 9 horses. Right. I mischaracterized that. 10 number of races per day. So the minimum is 11 seven. We're now operating at 9-1/2, which 12 isn't bad, right? 13 MR. MCHUGH: No. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: A lot better than the minimum. 15 16 MR. MCHUGH: Right, right. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Maybe it's 18 time to, sort of, take a straw pole here, to 19 see whether or not we -- you know, where are 20 minds are pretty well made up, or do we want 21 to debate this further or add something else? 22 At the moment we have -- well, we 23 have two proposals. We have the Plainridge 24 proposal, which is a hundred. We have the

horsemen saying, no, it should be amended to

125. And Alex has just thrown out, you know,

the possibility of splitting the baby. And if

we do that, has recommended that we do it at

110. Do you want to tell me -- tell us where

you all are and see whether we're ready to

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I don't think we need to keep talking. I think -- I have the least experience in this but -- so I'll just layout, you know, a couple thoughts that I had.

have a vote, or do we want to keep talking?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Good.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: One is that, you know, on the -- on the legal issue as to what the meaning of Section 24C is, I reviewed Mr. Corey's memorandum, and I reviewed the memorandum by our general counsel, and I find that our general counsel's conclusion that the word adjust is a neutral term, and that that empowers us to adjust either up or down.

With regard to how I come out on the -- on the consideration of the three

factors of field, demand and racing performance, this is just a kind of thing that I would be inclined -- that I am inclined to defer to those people on our staff who are, you know, empowered to make these -- to make these judgments on the basis of their -- their specialized experience over time. So I'm inclined to accept the recommendation of our director and approve 110 days.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm on the same -- on the same page, essentially, for the reasons that you state.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Those are two opinions -- two tentative support for the 110.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And I -- I think, frankly, Plainridge made the stronger argument here today and followed more closely with the law. But I do understand the horsemen's perspectively as well. And this is a good-news story. We'd like it to continue to be a good-news story, so I'm inclined to -- and I know this would be a one-year deal, rather than three, right, that's what we're

Page 170

1 looking at here. So I'd be inclined to the support the 110, as well. 2 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, there's 4 three. Do you want to --5 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Does it 6 matter what we say? 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, yeah, because I don't have to call the vote, if I 8 9 don't want to. 10 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: No. You 11 know, and again, you know, I appreciate the --12 the passion and the submissions we had from 13 both ends of the party. And, you know, I do look at both the track, our licensee, the 14 horsemen and this Commission kind of tied to 15 16 get to work as a team to keep moving the 17 success that we've realized. And, you know, Director Bedrosian stated it kind of well. 18 19 have this reenergized thoroughbred industry in 20 Massachusetts --21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Standardbred. 22 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Standardbred 23 Thoroughbreds will be next. sorry. And you

know, we're slowly turning the ship back

1 towards, you know, some path of success.

You know, I think there are ways to get over the perceptional hurdle, or the perceptional challenge that, you know, the members of the horsemen association would have of this, oh, my gosh, we're going from 125 to 100, a lot of that is based in just past history. You add the equation back on the other side of the three arguments as to why that's a good thing more race -- potentially, more races, better handle, and, you know, if we add -- if we get -- find a way to add the 30 ingredient of a multiyear deal so we're not talking about this again next year, you know, I think that that shows stability and it shows us continuing to move in the right direction.

I'm a little hesitant about, kind of, landing in this -- you know, at this number that seems to be, you know, a compromise, without really having some information to kind of test out what that would look like in number of fields, number of races. And I would hate to have us back here next year talking about 110, couldn't do it

now we're back to 100, and we just continue to fight this perceptional battle.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Which is the reason we encourage the sides to negotiate and come to an agreement before it gets to us, frankly.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: What we did hear is, if we do this, is continue their 114, 105. You know, kind of continue the negotiation for them. So I agree, the better option for them would be to have the sides agree, but that wasn't -- that wasn't the case we were faced with today.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm really not that concerned with -- or I don't find the argument about sending the wrong signal by decreasing 125 to 114 in this case, or 110 or whatever that case might be, that persuasive.

What I find -- what I've been trying to make the case, is that the average bettor is going to look at all these -- all these things that, as you mention in their brief Plainridge Park articulated well, which has to

do with the handle and the field size and the number of races per day, which are all good They're going up. Everybody can agree on that. I was -- I was thinking, given by the submission of the briefs, I would favor the hundred days that Plainridge submitted. But after all the discussion and the complicating elements that come into all these, including all the rules that we don't -- we should not be weighing in, I figured, as Dr. Lightbown and you as well, that maybe slitting the baby and getting the parties just, you know, together closer by issue of, you know, again splitting it was -was a good outcome.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But if you don't consider the momentum argument really compelling and do find the arguments that were in the PPC brief compelling, what -- so this is just, sort of, compromise because that's fair and reasonable, it's compromised, sort of, for the sake of compromise.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Essentially, to get it out of the way.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's going get out
of the way wherever we go.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, you know, actually, we're supposed to approve this application by statute before the 15th, right?

MS. BLUE: And I think -- if I could offer, maybe, a suggestion. Part of why we, kind of, are where we are is precisely because the statute requires us to have the applications in by October 1st. We have to decide by the 15th, and we're deciding the year before the calendar year for which the license is requested.

Under Chapter 128A, there is a provision that allows a licensee to file a supplemental license application, which would allow them to add days, if they wanted to.

So maybe one of the ways to address this now is to come to some agreement on what has been actually proposed and ask the parties to give it a little more time to think about it. Perhaps, they could come back with a proposal if they want more than a hundred days, if they could go through the

supplemental process and bring that back to you. So you could, you know, make your decision that you have to make by a certain date, but maybe they could use some more time to talk amongst themselves, as well.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Could that also work the other way, decrease the number of days after the subsequent approval?

MS. BLUE: Well, what you run into now, is under 128C, they have race a hundred days to simulcast. So there really is no below a hundred days, at this point, if PPC can't wants to simulcast, which I would assume that they do.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. Okay.

MS. BLUE: So it would be, you know, at this point, really, only potentially for an increase. And, perhaps, after more discussion they could come to some sort of agreement that they would both be more comfortable with. They do not have a purse agreement. They are supposed to have one by the end of every calendar year, so a lot of these details can be worked out in a purse agreement. So that

might be one way to make your decision and move it forward.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I just answer your point, Mr. Chairman. I do find that the notion of momentum very important. I just don't think that it hinges only on the number of races. I think it includes other things that were discussed --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Number of days.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Number of days, I'm sorry. It includes, fundamentally, number of races, purses, handle.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And what this legislature does.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

Fundamentally.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I just don't see putting it off, if they were not able to, last many months come to an agreement. I just don't know sending them back now makes a lot of sense, to me, because they weren't able to get there, knowing that we were dealing with this issue today.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And they can

always come back to us to raise the days, if they want, to whatever -- whatever we said is the starting point. I --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We could do

a -- approve the hundred-day notion and send

back to the parties to, hopefully, negotiate

some of these other things, including the

three-year deal that was at least on the table

that, at least in the minds of some, and you,

Commissioner Stebbins, creates also some

certainty and, you know, and look it a soon.

I do agree with your notion that, if they're this close and they couldn't do this for this amount of time that had already passed, we might as well just make the decision. So I'm torn between those two notions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. I think my bottom line is this is -- I find this like a 58/42 type -- or type question. But -- or 52/48 type question. I don't -- if the momentum argument is real, which I wonder if it is, but I know it's believed, I don't know whether it's -- actually is palpable in its

impact as they think, I don't see why splitting the baby helps. You know, if cutting back is giving a wrong signal, cutting back is giving a wrong signal. And I think, on the balance, the slight weighing of everything else, it sort of seems like it does make more sense to try to ramp up the field size. so I think I would come down on the hundred with a promise that it's at least a three-year commitment. So...

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I would go along with that, if that changes the consensus.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. So we've had ideas on the 110. We now have an idea of the 100 as with a three-year commitment. Does any of you feel differently about -- Bruce, I guess you didn't really make a -- or did you come -- as between those two, would you feel comfortable picking one?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Well, again, I was trying to make clear, I'm comfortable with a hundred, because I think the math has been spelled out better for us with a hundred

versus a middle number, which we really haven't really talked about.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: If we settle on a hundred, though, we're not really giving a lot of negotiating effort between the two parties. You know, a hundred is as low as they can go. What's the impetus for Plainridge to say, okay, I'll do more? I mean, you know, by that point I'd say, okay, fine, 110 and, you know, each -- each side gave a little bit.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, nobody's giving at this point. It's just us trying to -- nothing we do is --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Well, it's us, you know, kinds of, giving each party something to walk out of here with.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And I think the incentive might be, okay, 110. But, you know, the flat participation from Massachusetts here, we'd love to see that increase. And -- you know, so that we are -- we have more Massachusetts -- there is a

Page 180

breeding program, we're using that. And so, I think that would be a better way to come before us for more days, would be look how much it's increased here in Massachusetts. The programs and their — they can supply enough horses. So I think there is room to work. So I just think, maybe, this one year at 110 and we'll address it again next year, maybe with stronger numbers. Who knows.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Well, hopefully, we won't address it next year, if we can get a three-year deal and it's 110.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, that's still -- well, they can come up.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: They denied that three-year deal. They had that on the table and couldn't take it earlier.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No. But he's put it back -- Steve has said, if we adopt a hundred today, he will commit to.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But he offered that to the horsemen earlier and they did not take that offer. Why would they do it now?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, they -- we're doing it. Doesn't matter what they

3 think.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Oh, oh, I'm sorry. I thought you were -- I thought you were asking them to go back. Okay. That's an option for us.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Steve is saying, I will commit here, in front of the Commission, that I will not go back for a reduction for three years, if we go to a hundred. There could easily be discussions about going up, but not going down.

commissioner zunigh: And the economics will dictate that. I mean, what is it -- the question you posed, what is it that prevents? Well, the opportunity to make money because if there's -- if there's more money out there, there will be more -- more races.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, it is important to note, the only way for the track to make money is through the handle. The purses do not affect the bottom line for PPC.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's how we make

1 money, too.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We do too.

You're right about that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does having the second option on the table change either of your -- are you more comfortable -- is either of you more comfortable with the three-year guarantee of a hundred than the one year of 110; does that change?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: It doesn't really change my view. But I don't feel very strongly about it. My position remains the same. I'm respecting the judgment of the people that have been in this on our staff, who is been professionally engaged in this for their professional lifetimes. So I would stick with the recommendation of the staff, but I'm not going to strongly oppose a hundred.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah, I feel the same way. Although, I do think I'd like to stick the 110 and just give people an opportunity to know that we think it's important that they negotiate. And that's

always a better decision, when the parties can come together. But that wasn't -- they weren't able to do it. So I do feel like what -- if we do this, we're just -- we're kind of continuing their negotiation there.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And having one year, to your point, would allow at least, we'd say the next year would -- it's still subject to negotiation, in other words.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We have a hand raised.

MR. COREY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just request, on behalf of the horsemen, to lead the considerations with one year. I don't think the statute contemplates three years. And if, on our interest, we are asking for something more than 100 days, to have that arrangement extend for three years is even worse than just one year.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This isn't the commitment to run a hundred days. This is the commitment to not reduce below a hundred days.

MR. COREY: I understand that. But since our argument is based on one year, to

have any decision extend for three years would be adverse to our interest, and was not something we contemplated when we made our argument to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: How does a three --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me, Bruce,
I'm sorry. Just a minute ago you said to me,
you know what they're going to do, they're
going to come back next year and ask for 80.
And they're promising not to and you're saying
you don't want them to promise?

MR. COREY: No. I'm just -- what

I'm saying is, is that the experience over the

course of the next year will give us new data

points that we can consider. It would be

preferrable to have that lookback as the

proper frame of reference, rather than have us

locked into the next three years before the

review can take place.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So if the horse -if the number of horses per race drops, you're
okay with going down on those days?

MR. COREY: We're willing to take

1 that risk. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Seems crazy to me, 3 but all right. All right. So we're back --4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So on that 5 argument, I'll solidify on my initial position 6 after I reviewed -- revised it and go with the 7 110 for one year. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So Mr. Chair, 8 9 I move that we approve the application for 10 Plainridge Park Casino raceway, and make the 11 decision for them to race 110 days. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think I'll have 13 a role car vote. Commissioner Cameron? COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 14 Aye. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner Macdonald. 16 17 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I was going 18 to second it. But I aye. 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, sorry. 20 want to second? 21 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Yeah, I was 22 going to second. 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. 24 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:

	Page 186
1	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner
2	Zuniga.
3	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
4	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And Commissioner
5	Stebbins.
6	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
7	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And Commissioner
8	Crosby votes nay. So 4 to 1, with Commission
9	Crosby dissenting. All right. So we are
10	going to have 110 race days next year. And
11	see you next year.
12	MR. COREY: Thank you,
13	Commissioners.
14	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: See you later.
15	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. Let's
17	see now. It's one o'clock.
18	COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: We went two
19	hours over our time.
20	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, we've go the
21	website and the LMS and a at least one
22	topic of significance on
23	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So maybe have
24	a 30 minute break.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. So maybe 2 have a lunch break. We'll come back at 1:35. 3 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: 4 like Janice --5 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Hang on just 6 a second. Let me chat with you just a second. 7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Let's take five minutes. 8 9 10 (A recess was taken) 11 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. We are 13 reconvening public meeting No. 228 at about 14 1:15. And we are going to the legal division. 15 I guess, who's on first here? 16 MS. BLUE: Good afternoon, 17 Commissioners. We have, before you today, 205 CMR 138 and 140. This is the amendments that 18 19 we brought before you before on the treatment 20 of unsecured funds. Deputy General Counsel 21 Grossman is going to present to you a little 22 bit on some of the comments we received and 23 the changes that resulted in those comments, 24 and then we're going to ask for your approval

Page 188

1 to start the promulgation process, so it 2 should be pretty quick. 3 MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon. 5 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: 6 afternoon. 7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good 8 afternoon. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good 10 afternoon. 11 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 12 afternoon. 13 MR. GROSSMAN: We were before you on October 12th, we sent them out for formal 14 15 comment, both on our website and to our 16 licensees. Plainridge Park Casino did offer a 17 few comments, which we have incorporated here 18 in green. As you can see, they're fairly 19 self-explanatory. 20 There is one other comment they 21 offered that we're still talking about 22 internally. But I don't think we should 23 necessarily get into it here today, but there 24 could be further adjustment during the

1 process. But the good news is, we're just 2 asking that we begin the promulgation process here today so everyone will have another 3 4 chance to comment on all of this, and we can 5 make any further modifications down the road. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you want to --7 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I'll make a motion. 8 9 MR. GROSSMAN: So with that, you 10 know, there's only -- we only changed a couple of words here in green. There's nothing --11 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Why don't you just 13 quick, give the highlight? 14 MR. GROSSMAN: You want me to talk about it? 15 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Unless everybody's clear with it. 17 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think it's 19 self-explanatory. The words just define --20 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I've 21 reviewed it. 22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: -- better define the term. 23 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Fine.

	Page 190
1	let's go ahead Commission
2	COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I move that
3	the Commission approve the amendments to 205
4	CMR 138 and 205 CMR 140, relating to gaming
5	date and treatment of unsecured funds, as
6	included in the packet, and authorize the
7	staff to take the steps necessary to begin the
8	regulation promulgation process.
9	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.
10	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
11	discussion? All in favor? Aye.
12	COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
13	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
14	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
15	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
16	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes
17	have it unanimously. Thank you.
18	MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you.
19	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Next up.
21	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: She's been
22	waiting all day for this.
23	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: She been back
24	there warming up for this for four hours.

Page 191

1 MS. DRISCOLL: Good afternoon, 2 Commissioners. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon. 4 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Good 5 afternoon. 6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good 7 afternoon. 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good 9 afternoon. 10 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 11 afternoon. Oh, Amy, you going to work the PowerPoint? 12 13 MR. SANGALANG: I got it. MS. DRISCOLL: Oh. Oh, you have it 14 15 from there. Okay. All right. 16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Amy's 17 handling the live stream right now. 18 MS. DRISCOLL: All right. 19 hopefully, this is just a fun, quick update on 20 something interesting that we've been, working 21 We started this process, oh, my goodness, on. 22 probably about, maybe, seven months ago now. 23 And it has been a bit lengthy, but we just 24 felt that it was time to do a major refresh of massgaming.com. I know that the chairman, you had actually also mentioned, at the time, you were inquiring about the placement of a few different things. And that, basically, got us thinking.

And first and foremost, one of the most important changes that will be made is that it will be completely mobile-enabled, which is great. And that's really the most significant work. And just even in terms of cost, the most expensive aspect of the new development, because now it will be completely mobile-enabled on smart phones, tablets. And I'll get into this in a -- more in a minute.

But, currently, what happens, when you go to the massgaming.com website from your iPhone or your iPad, you basically get a little mini version of it. So you can -- it's useable, but it's not all that efficient now. It will be completely mobile-adapted, so it'll be really nice.

So without further adieu, we're going to take you quickly through the process. So we set out to do two things, which was

essentially, completely update the homepage of the website. And what's exciting about it, is that now it more so reflects where we're at, in terms of the evolution of the Commission.

What our needs were in 2012, in terms of the type of information that needed to be on the homepage, is actually a lot different than where we're at now.

So we really approached this from the thought process that the number of gaming constituents that are going to start visiting massgaming.com, largely, many of them seeking employment, seeking out information about the licensing and registering process to become a gaming employee -- so we really wanted to create that with them in mind.

In a lot of ways, the way the site was created in 2012 was for our potential gaming license applicants, and then also host and surrounding communities that were inquiring about process and things like that. And we're quite a ways evolved from that at this point. You can look what up now, you can get a feel for what a site will look like on

mobile devices. And I'll take it through that, too, in a minute.

And the other thing is, is that, when we started in 2012 it was all about like, explain, explain, explain, because we really knew that people were starting from a point of not having any information about gaming at all. So everything that we did was very detailed in its explanation. I mean, even down to the drop-down menus on the website, every single drop-down came with, like, a one-sentence explanation of even what that page would lead you to. We're far beyond that at this point, so we really fell like it was time to simplify.

The way we approached the redesign, two things, just a close look at, basically, user data, research, you know, what people were currently -- where were they going, how long were they spending on pages, things like that. And then, we actually issued a survey monkey, both internally to find out how staff and whatnot use the site, and then also externally to a pretty significant following

that we have on our constant contact, who receive our newsletters and things like that.

And interestingly enough, when we got the feedback, in terms of how they use the site, it was a great way to define, you know, how we prioritize homepage real estate, what the key services needs to be. So many people reported back to us that they always come to the site to look up the law and define the law, or many people reported back that they're very interested knowing more about horseracing.

And then, obviously, meeting archives, meeting notifications, live stream. Things like that. And then, most prominently, the licensing page for employees, potential gaming employees, and then also, a quick link to where they can get to the gaming licensee pages, so Wynn's page, MGM, Plainridge, to find out more specifically what job opportunities are available.

So some of the new features on the homepage that you'll see in a minute include, like I just mentioned, key services, based on

the feedback from individuals, in terms of what areas of interest were of the most priority.

An area that we particularly like, which is programs and initiatives, a special place for that where we can highlight programs thing like the GameSense program, PlayMyWay, most importantly, SEIGMA, a quick homepage link to all of our important game research, and things like the Fair Deal program, for example.

Another section that we added is called At A Glance. This is great because it's just, sort of, a fun factoid section. So for example, some of the numbers that were being given today about -- during Wynn Boston Harbor's quarterly report, like some of the really fascinating numbers about, you know, the million --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Million. Million tons.

MS. DRISCOLL: Yeah. This is an area to be able to promote some of that. But this is -- this is an area to be able to

really promote some of that. But it was also really created keeping all of the different gaming research that we have coming out on a regular basis, a really prominent place to feature some of those interesting numbers.

And also, and Paul will speak to this, we're excited about the fact that the new compatibility of massgaming.com will have the updated license management system, which is also very mobile-friendly. And now, those two systems will be compatible. So that's pretty exciting for us.

And it also includes some other new fun and interesting features. And this was Commissioner Zuniga's idea, which is creating some, sort of, digital timeline just on the whole process. It's really interesting and we'll take you through that. But, basically, just hits on all of the key milestones over the last several years. And so, I'll show you the timeline.

And then, one, I just want to commend Mike for his work on this. He's, particularly in the last couple of weeks, as

2.1

we're getting ready to make this transfer he's had to do a couple of difficult things, which is, when they started the development of this it was important that we had to maintain a very detailed record of every single thing we've put on the current massgaming.com site. And the fact of the matter is, so much goes up there on a daily basis, and so many changes. So poor Mike has had to keep that detailed record to make sure we don't lose anything when we dot transfer next week. And he's done a great job with that. And just a great eye for detail on some important things to make sure that everything goes smoothly.

Also, back a couple of months ago, for whatever reason, we had had a couple instances of outages and things like that. So the system that Jack Rabbit has come up with will be more secure. I can let Mike speak to that for a bit, to make sure that we don't -- we decrease any potential for outages as much as possible.

MR. SANGALANG: Yeah. So the new -- we're migrating both massgaming.com and

gamesensema.com to a new server. The server is more stable. You should see fewer outages in the future. Not that we've had that many, but one is too many. It's quicker. It's faster. When you click around the site starting next week you'll notice the pages load faster. And that's going to be more important with, you know, more multimedia, video, that kind of thing. People looking at it from, possibly, slower devices. And it is SSL certified now, which means that someone entering personal information into the site can know and can be assured that their information is encrypted to the highest standards and it is secure.

It doesn't affect the information that people are entering through LMS. But to know that the entire Mass Gaming site is secure would give users that additional piece of mind.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: What does SSL stand for?

MR. SANGALANG: That's beyond my pay grade. Secure socket layer, but no further

1 questions.

MS. DRISCOLL: And this is the borings stuff, but something that Mike and I are excited about, which is the administrative side of it. So like, the uploading of content an things like that. Jack Rabbit has modernized it even more than it already was, and has also made it even more intuitive.

And one, we really appreciate that, number one. And number two, it's great in terms of longevity for training up other employees that we want to know how to -- whether it's load in public meeting notifications, or whatever. If we want to start training up additional people on that. But the administrative side of it that nobody ever sees, really, except for Mike, is really nice. And we were excited when we saw that so...

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Are you using the term "Jack Rabbit?"

MS. DRISCOLL: Jack Rabbit is --

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Is that the

24 server?

1

MS. DRISCOLL: They're our

2

developers. So they're our consultants.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

They're our vendor that -- who actually created massgaming.com originally. they've actually been a great parter to us over the years, in terms of just, you know, understanding what our needs are, being -- and also being very highly responsive to us. they actually did the development.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And I might add, very cost effective, because I remember that procurement. And you know --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: At the right place, Mr. Treasurer.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Compared to many others.

MS. DRISCOLL: Yes. And it's funny. It's not like the site is that old. But back in 2012 when we first -- which, by the way, it was one the first major things that the communications department took on, because it was -- the site's been that important to us from the get. But even back in 2012, the mobile-enable feature wasn't where it is now.

1 So here we are, only five years later, but 2 really needed a complete rehaul on it, you 3 know. 4 MR. SANGALANG: About 35 to 5 40 percent visitors to massgaming.com are 6 looking on it on mobile or tablet now. 7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Is that 8 right? 9 MR. SANGALANG: Right. 10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Have the numbers gone up? 11 12 MR. SANGALANG: Oh, yeah. 13 MS. DRISCOLL: So if you want to just -- Mike, if we can just give them a view. 14 I'll quickly give you a view of the home page. 15 We looked to do the -- start the 16 17 transfer on Monday. We don't anticipate any 18 issues but you never know. But we hope that 19 it will be smooth. 20 So as you can see, a much more 21 modern-looking page. Mike, if you could just 22 scroll over the navigation bar so they can see 23 the drop down. See how much more simple the 24 drop down is now? Before it was like a huge

Page 203

box with explanations under everything. And then, if you keep just scrolling down, here are all of the key services. As you can see, find a job, employee, licensing, revenue. And again, this was all -- revenue was always a very popular page but simple iconography, really easy to use.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does find a job -- I know I asked you this before, does find a

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does find a job -
I know I asked you this before, does find a

job get you not only to our jobs, but is it

also to the licensee's jobs?

MS. DRISCOLL: It's to the licensee's jobs.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, that is to the licensees.

MS. DRISCOLL: Yeah. MGC's jobs is actually up at the very top. It's a separate --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, okay.

MR. SANGALANG: There is a link within find a job to our job page.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

MS. DRISCOLL: Yeah. And if you could just keep scrolling down. These are can

change out, too, based on, you know, whatever the priority is at the time.

We have a new news and announcement section that actually allows for our graphics to be displayed, which we didn't have before. You'd have to click in to the news and announcement to see the graphic. But we do so much graphic work, and Mike does a lot of great graphics so we wanted to find a way to maximize the use of those more.

Programs and initiative, this is one of my favorite sections. If you could just scroll over them. See, when you scroll over they flip to give you a quick -- and, again, we can change all these out based on whatever, you know, our new programs, our initiatives are, or whatever our priorities are.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Can you add more?

MS. DRISCOLL: You could add more.

I mean, it's a bit of a design choice so that

it doesn't get --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So you can't have a second line, a second layer?

MS. DRISCOLL: I think they would

Page 205

It's just in terms of, like, scroll across. how many sections you want to have and -- but, yeah, but we could add more. And, again, these very easily change out. Upcoming events, you can click on it now and see the full calendar. But as you know, the current website has actual -- the full calendar. we've gone to a bit more efficient layout. So it'll highlight two at a time, but you can very easily hit view all and go to a full calendar. Here's the At A Glance section. And it highlights again, gaming research. can click on Wynn Boston Harbor. See some interesting factoids about Wynn. Again, these very easily change out. And we can have whatever topics we want.

And then, similarly, you scroll down, you can see some of our Twitter activity and there you are right there and that's -- oh, I thought that was from today, but it's actually not, because the one I saw they're already pulling in our Tweets so it's already working.

MR. SANGALANG: This is from earlier

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

today. Let me refresh it and see what comes up.

MS. DRISCOLL: But what's cool -see, look. I Tweeted that earlier today, when
Wynn was giving their diversity update. But
what's cool about this is, this also now
allows for graphics, which we Tweet a lot.
And the prior format didn't allow for that.

One thing we really didn't want to lose, if you keep scrolling down is the stay updated section, this is how people sign up to get our newsletters and things like that. And there's still very much a regular interest in signing up to get news and updates, so we didn't want to lose that function.

And then, as you can see, too, at the very bottom, we -- there's multiple places where you can do this, but there's always a lot of interest in trying to get to Plainridge and MGM and Wynn and Wynn and their sites, so we just wanted to give -- give quick and easy links to do that because there's a lot of interest in that always.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Elaine, is

this the population that you earlier described that you reached out to get their advice on?

MS. DRISCOLL: That's right. And if you want to just take them to the timeline page really quick. This is just, like I said, a new interesting feature, and Commissioner Zuniga thought this would be a great idea, too, particularly for new employees that might want -- that come on board and kind of want to take a look.

What's interesting about this is you can do it according to categories of interest. So whether you want to look up a timeline, or you want to look up a timeline only specific to Region A. If you can just scroll down, Mike, and show them -- yeah. See, so there you can see, you can click on anything. It's -- yeah, it's really interesting.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: It's a master timeline.

MS. DRISCOLL: Yeah, master timeline. And we're still in the process of populating it. This is one of those things that we'll always have to keep up to date.

1 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: It's a 2 story. 3 Yeah. MS. DRISCOLL: It's a 4 interesting feature. And, like I said, 5 Commissioner Zuniga suggested that we do 6 something like that. So that's something 7 that -- and it happened to coincidence so it 8 made sense to marry those things together. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Keeping that --10 who's job is it to keep that up to date? MS. DRISCOLL: Mike and I. 11 12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, one of the -- yeah, well, one of the ideas about the 13 14 timeline, at least initially, but I love the 15 way this looks because it seems to be, you 16 know, summarized, is to allow the network 17 effect, others to start putting -- others 18 here, internally, to start identifying 19 important milestones and things like that. 20 But we can work on that.

MS. DRISCOLL: Yeah, that would be greats. We actually have a master Excel sheet that we're working from. And we intend to keep -- we think that that's important to keep

21

22

23

	Page 209
1	that up so that we have
2	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The pictures
3	look great.
4	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The clarity of
5	photographs.
6	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I got to say,
7	one of those updates appear to be a lot more
8	white hair on some of the commissioners'
9	heads.
10	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Did you
11	notice that.
12	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: White or none.
13	MS. DRISCOLL: We can easily change
14	that out, too.
15	COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I think
16	Gayle and I would like to be included.
17	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Can you
18	airbrush?
19	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Can you
20	airbrush.
21	MR. BEDROSIAN: The one thing I
22	think Elaine and the communications department
23	has done a good job is reflecting, in the
24	website, the maturation of the Commission, in

general. I think, back when you all started, licensing meant something extremely different than it does now. It was a macro thing, now it's a micro thing. And this is a really good job of reflecting that, that you've gone from the major licensing and we're really moving towards operations and steady state. And they really did a really good job reflecting.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah.

MS. DRISCOLL: The one thing I neglected to mention, you can see it at the top, and actually it's going to be red, for some reason it's not red yet, we have a breaking news alert up at the top. So if someone goes to the site and we have a live stream happening at that time, it'll say, you know, that there's a live stream happening or -- you know, sometimes in the winter we have a closing or, you know, any -- a technical issue with the phones or something like that we can easily put up an alert just to let people know.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Is there part of the websites where litigation

1 developments or the litigation record and 2 pending cases? 3 MS. DRISCOLL: Legal is one of the 4 categories on the timeline. 5 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Oh, okay. 6 MS. DRISCOLL: But it would be 7 interesting. We could add a legal page, 8 easily. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We typically 10 report -- there's a section in the annual 11 report, which is a short summary of litigation 12 matters but... 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It happens so 14 often, you know, there's so much going on all 15 the time, that might be an interesting -- at least to keep us up to speed. 16 17 MS. DRISCOLL: Yeah. But it's easy 18 to update, easy to make changes, so we've been 19 really happy with --20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Looks great. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Looks fabulous. 22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: The graphics 23 are amazing. Look at the -- look at that. 24 MS. DRISCOLL: Yeah, we spent a lot

	Page 212
1	of time.
2	MR. SANGALANG: A lot of time.
3	MS. DRISCOLL: We spent poor
4	Mike. We spent a lot of time on that piece.
5	MR. SANGALANG: This is from the
6	CATCH Institute, the shuffling.
7	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Oh, it is.
8	COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Oh, isn't
9	that great.
10	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's from
11	Eric's roulette class.
12	MS. DRISCOLL: So that's the new
13	site. And, like I said, we'll begin to make
14	the transfer next week. Again, things can be
15	easily updated, but I think that the layout's
16	there, in terms of that it will serve us very
17	well moving forward.
18	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You had to wear
19	glasses to get into that picture.
20	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Oh, is that
21	what it was?
22	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Throw them
23	on.
24	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mine are on

	Page 213
1	and off all day long.
2	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I was
3	thinking, I should have been like this, since
4	we went around
5	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thanks.
6	That's terrific.
7	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's fabulous.
8	Yeah, it looks great.
9	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Nice job.
10	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thanks for
11	all the work on that.
12	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Really great
13	job Elaine and Michael.
14	COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
15	Congratulations to both of you.
16	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great job to both
17	of you.
18	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah, great
19	job to both of you.
20	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah, great
21	job.
22	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's exciting.
23	MS. DRISCOLL: Now, we'd like to
24	pass it over to Paul, because, like I said,

what we're excited about is how compatible the new Mass Gaming and the new license management system is. And we will -- and Paul can explain that.

MR. CONNELLY: Great. And as Elaine said, the website really is designed to, you know, meet the needs of the people who are looking for information from us. And it really provides an excellent entryway for any applicant to find LMS.

Just as a sidenote for full disclosure, the -- you know, the prominent place of the LMS, this is my second favorite piece of the website. The first is, my hand at the CATCH Institute, I'm the last person at the table.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Oh, you are?

MR. CONNELLY: And I just to note I
won big that day.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Did you get a blackjack in that hand?

MR. CONNELLY: Oh, I made a few hundred dollars in fake money. Not typical of my normal performance.

1

2 3 4

So, again, this is -- it's really kind of interesting, because I was just sitting here thinking, we're either a year exactly, or a year and a few days from when we launched LMS internally. So to recap, we've been using LMS internally to process applications or -- started with some applications, now all applications, for a year. And it, kind of, was lost on me that we're literally on the one year anniversary of But the reason I wanted to give a brief that. today was, on the 26th of September we went live with the public application portal. previously, we had been receiving applications on paper and processing them through LMS, now we have the portal, and you can see the homepage there, where individual applicants can go and submit their application for registration or licensure on line.

And so, this is a big change, and this is really a critical change in our ability to process, you know, the big wave, the tsunami, whatever we wants to call it, of applications we expect to receive from MGM.

22

23

Page 216

This is a critical component in our ability to actually do that in a timely manner. So, so far since the 26th we've processed about 50 applications through LMS, meaning submitted electronically with really good results.

We had talked a lot, internally, that, you know, whenever you do a public launch of any kind of system, it's, you know, you contest it, you know, 10 ways to center, but it's always the things you don't expect that catch you. And that's what we've experienced. Fortunately, none of the issues we've had have been critical issues. had a few network issues that were working to resolve. But in general, my understanding, based on feedback from the licensees and applicants themselves, that the system is pretty straightforward and, really, people aren't having major issues, in terms of submitting their apps. So that's hugely important to us because this has to be a seamless, a seamless process, and a seamless way for people to submit.

I do want to note that none of it

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

would be successful without a close partnership with the casinos and human resources. They are really the first point of entry for these folks. They get a job offer. At which point -- or contingent job offer, at which point they're directed to LMS. So a lot of the education happens up front from the human resources department. And one of the things we'll show in a minute is some of the efforts we're taking on the MGC side. know, and it was a great project with Mike and Elaine to put together some training materials, some video to introductory. we'll show that again. But, again, I do want to highlight the great work and collaboration of the casinos' human resources in helping us get these applicants educated and through the system.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: And Paul, to date, the applicant pool that you're describing that are using the system are comprised of what, in general; are these individuals, or are they more business that are looking to --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

MR. CONNELLY: That's a greet question. So these are all individual applicants for licensure or registration to work at a casino. We're still processing the vendor applications on paper for a couple of reasons. One, the volume is highly

manageable, the timelines are a little bit

different, as well.

You know, and I -- I was on my phone a little bit when Elaine was talking, not because I wasn't paying attention, but I was actually in LMS moving things forward. You know, just, kind of, things that, administratively, I could move because tomorrow's the, you know, observed holiday, wanted to get things done this afternoon. But to -- you know, to speak to the ability to access things in a mobile environment, and what was it, 65 percent of people are

accessing our site that way. It's the way

everything's going and it's been a great -- a

great help to us, in terms of keeping things

efficient.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So while

Elaine was speaking, you a approved a couple of licenses?

MR. CONNELLY: I moved a few along. You know, I signed them out so my staff could actually work on them this afternoon. before they go away for the weekend. So with that, I wonder if we could pull up the video. again, this was a -- this video and LMS itself, I want to say, are -- you know, works in progress in the sense that, we're putting these out there and we're always looking for feedback to make sure that not only the message is direct, but also, the messaging within LMS. I had the opportunity to sit down with Chairman Crosby the other day and go through it. And the language in the system matters. You know, what instruction you give is very important. That's something I expect is going to be, you know, a constantly moving target to make sure we're -- we're working people through the system effectively.

MS. DRISCOLL: This is the registration video.

MR. CONNELLY: And this video -- so

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Page 220

we have two versions -- thanks, Elaine. We have two versions. We have two versions. One for folks who are registering, and one for folks who are going for licensure, because they are different processes. But we're going to show the one for the registrant.

(Video playing)

MR. CONNELLY: So the hope is that

-- you know, that video, if anyone's
interested in general in the process they
could view it, or also during some licensing
events we could show that. You know, get
people a little bit oriented. There's a lot
of information in there. You know, it's
dense. So we don't expect that someone
watches that and then walks right in and knows
everything to do. But it certainly gives you
a high understanding of what to expect
throughout the process.

Also, we blew our budget on the voice over. You know, but -- no, I want to note Amy did that and it -- you know, it

1 really -- did such a great job. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is that Amy? 3 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Verv 4 professional. 5 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Great job. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 6 Great. You could 7 do that on the side, make a few bucks. 8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Paul, if --9 say someone didn't know how to upload their 10 Veterans' form, would they automatically call 11 or e-mail, or are there further drop down, 12 this is what you do? 13 MR. CONNELLY: So they can always 14 reach out to us, you know, for technical 15 assistance. We're working, like I said, on 16 that, you know, making sure that the messaging and -- you know, any kind of error messaging, 17 18 as well as instructional messaging within the 19 the system, we haven't found yet. And that's 20 one of those things that I really want to keep 21 my ears and eyes open to, problems with the 22 upload piece, in terms of how to do it. 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 24 individuals know how to do it.

MR. CONNELLY: You know, and also, again, that's where I want to give credit to human resources, they're lending a hand. But it is, it's one of those things that people have encountered before, and so they're somewhat used to it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Right.

_

MR. CONNELLY: And in terms of the living, kind of, nature of all of this, one thing that I don't know if we picked up on, but in the very beginning it said all service employees must register. That, obviously -- you know, we developed this before that pass. So, I mean, these are messages that we're going to constantly evolve, based on where we are, you know, both with our processes as well as technology.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I asked the same question about upload, and I was made to understand that only a people of a certain age ask a question like that.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, isn't that interesting. Well, I fall into that category, because I thought people wouldn't

Page 223

1 necessarily how to do -- what if they -- if 2 they don't have a birth certificate but they 3 have a state ID and they have a passport, is 4 two out of three enough? MR. CONNELLY: So it's either. 5 Ιf 6 you have a passport, that's all you need. 7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Oh, I see. 8 MR. CONNELLY: If you don't have 9 passport, you need birth certificate and a 10 state-issued ID. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great. As 12 Paul said, I used it had as if I were an 13 applicant the other day. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: You did? 14 How 15 many times did you call? CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, I had 16 17 questions that came down later on. Places 18 where I got stuck, like, how the hell am I 19 going to upload something? 20 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: He also has 21 a new job at MGM. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But it was great. 23 I mean, it was really simple -- simple, 24 intuitive system. You know the kinds of

suggestions I had, you know, were really minimal on the margins. You know, it's a really clean, simple, straightforward.

You know, the scary thing is scale, you know. And just because 40 people use it that are being hand-held as a practical matter, doesn't mean that when 400 are using it, it'll work. But it seems to me that they're doing everything they can possibly do to field test it and, you know, adapt it and so forth. So it's impressive.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Looks great.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Paul, do you expect to have a -- kind of, an internal help desk here for people to contact if people get stuck.

MR. CONNELLY: So you're kind of looking at one of them right now. So that e-mail and that phone number, you know, everyone in my team can triage.

And so, part of -- the LMS, the public applicant portal really, I think I've said, represents a shift in some of the focus

of my team's business, where, when you're taking things in on paper, just as you can imagine, it's a lots of, you know, keeping track of intake as things come in and where is it and moving it along. When individuals are able to submit their applications on line, the system takes care of a lot of duties that a person would have to normally log, right. So we've relieved the team of a lot of those burdens, which is exactly what you want to do with an online system. But what it does now is -- puts them in more directed contact with the applicant. When, in a paper world it was really kind of a one-to-one relationship where it was the MGC with HR, and then HR dealt with all of their applicants.

When people come in individually, even though they do, kind of, come through a gateway at the casino level, we then interact with them directly. And with that, means that the -- my staff becomes more, kind of, customer service oriented and helps in terms of technical assistance. So they have been doing that already. You know, even through

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 these 40. And so, it's a great opportunity 2 now, with the numbers being really manageable 3 to build our understanding and our skill sets 4 across the whole team. You know, I said 5 you're looking of them. To be honest, I 6 really only very rarely jump in because I 7 don't need to, because my team's in a -- is really well-positioned to do that. But that 8 9 is, that's kind of one of the shits in the 10 workload we have is, now, really dealing more with customer service than -- than kind of 11 12 processing, or the addition of customer 13 service, I should say, because we'll always be doing processing and review. 14 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Looks great. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Looks great. 16 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Sure does. 18 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good job. 19 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Very 20 impressive. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else, 22 anybody? 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you 24 both, too. Tremendous.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Great work. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, great. All 3 right. We are getting close. I think the 4 last thing is Commissioner Updates. And there 5 is a tab, but I think there -- I do have one 6 thing. Is there --7 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: There was 8 something on sealing here. See, See, 9 S-E-A-L-I-N-G. 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Records. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. Well, 12 there's several things. I'll get to that. 13 But did any other commissioner have any 14 update? 15 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I had just a 16 couple. Keeping Paul in mind, Paul, Jill and 17 I when out to Springfield last Friday, met 18 with the MGM procurement team that was in from 19 Las Vegas. Talked about changes in licensing.

We also had assembled with us members of their

vendor advisory team. Great introduction

to -- to supply MGM when they open their

about their procurement folks by a number of

great resources to try to find local vendors

20

21

22

23

1 doors. Good meeting.

Also had good news that -- exciting news. A young co-op student from Putnam High School has been working on site at the MGM construction site. This is kind of unheard of. I don't understand all the details. But it's not an easy process to make that. But, you know, thanks to the carpenters local out there, and Jason Grand and Lisa Collasen (phonetically), as well as the MGM contractors to kind of make this happen. Somebody out there as a co-op student getting some work time on the MGM construction site.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. One of the things that I got involved in, when I was working on the CORI -- the registration -- the gaming employee service issue, was, as I mentioned, this group community folks, as well as local legislators, who put their shoulder to the wheel and helped us get this thing done.

One of them now -- several of them,

but in the form of one, Representative Liz Malia, from Jamaica Plain, Boston, has asked if we would be willing to weigh in on -in support of some of the issues -- not all of the issues, but some of the issues that they're supporting in this big package, which you've read in the paper, that's going through And I've talked about this with the House. And she said this is something we Catherine. could discuss as a commissioner update. And if the sense of the group is that we could support one or more of these things, then I could take the initiative and follow through on that, as I have with some other ones.

So I think the second page is really the key one. The first one is just other jurisdictions. They're talking about the issue of reducing waiting periods to apply for seal any records, sealing arrest convictions — of resisting arrest convictions, sorry, the particular crime of resisting arrest convictions, and also adding this ability, if your record is sealed, to be able to say I have not record clarifying that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

They all seemed pretty -- and they were presented for us not for we would like to have your help in CORI reform, because I said, that's hot really our business. They would like to have us be supported, if we are, as a workforce development issue. That these are issues which their -- Representative Malia was saying would also make it easier for some of the people that we've talked about through our own discussion to get into the application process. So I just throw it out there and look for your -- your comments on all three of them.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mr. Chair, I have concerns doing this because -- well, for one thing, only one stakeholder has weighed in. And they are supportive of two of the provisions, the sheriff's association, the DAs have not weighed in at all yet, which makes it is difficult for me to understand the issues well enough to come out in support of this.

Secondly, you know, these are not specific to gaming. They may affect some of our work but not necessarily. And I just -- I

guess I'm just -- just have concerns that
maybe that's not our role as a regulator to,
you know, I really think -- and the
legislature's debating this now. And I think
they're more suited to, A, understand the
issues better, and B, you know, kind of, make
the decisions in this area.

So I just think, as a gaming regulator, I just have concerns that we're wading into an area that's not ours. And secondly, I personally don't feel I have enough information here to know what our consequences are, unintended consequences.

Certainly, on the face of it they look like really good recommendations. But without really knowing more from stakeholders and just thinking about what our role is here, I just have some concerns?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What is this timeline that they were looking for; is it something we could come back and discuss, let's say, next week and understand some of those --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, we could.

The legislation is in the process in -- well, no, I guess it's passed both House and Senate and this point, right?

MR. BEDROSIAN: Well, the senate -the senate has passed. And I think the House
has passed. And then, now they're going to go
on recess and appoint conference committee.
So this is somewhat the far down the pike, I
think.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, so I think
we could -- when this was originally presented
to us it hadn't passed the House, where Rep
Malia's from. It now, I believe, has passed
the House, and so there's a conferencing
committee that'll be coming. So yes, we
could -- if we wanted to pursue it, but wanted
to get more information about some of it, we
could do that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think I would. I mean, I have an opinion of at least one of them, but I'd much rather sort of understand to your point what may be other stakeholders concerns or implication.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah. Those

1 who really work in this field.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, I think number three could apply to gaming, because we ask a lot of questions, indirectly at least.

And I think the point is well-taken. Maybe, we can just think about it a little bit better and understand -- get more background and weigh in, if anybody's comfortable.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: And when you say it's fairly far down the pike, do you mean that, kind of, the horse is out of the barn?

MR. BEDROSIAN: Well, and I'm going to tell you the basis of my knowledge -- the basis of my knowledge is State House news. I know the Senate is absolutely passed their version of criminal justice reform. I think the House has -- actually, I'm less sure on the House as I am on the Senate. They will then appoint a conference committee.

So when I say it's fairly well, I guess I'm talking about the legislative process of the two branches establishing their positions will be negotiated in a conference

1 committee.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So does that suggest to you that we really don't have that much of a practical opportunity to engage?

MR. BEDROSIAN: Boy, I guess that's really a strategic point of view. One is, you know, that -- to affect the formation of legislation, yes, it's probably too late for that. Can people have influence in conference committees, sure. I don't know if this would be the way to have influence on conference committees. But, again, my knowledge of State House news, Senate had passed, and I believe House had, also. And there are differences, and they were going to go to a conference committee.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There is something, and I apologize that I didn't clarify this in advance, but if you notice that first point up above, of the CORI reform issue, says "CSG report." I didn't know what that is. It's the -- and when the staff person got back to me, it's the council on

state government report.

And there is something that is being debated next Monday and Tuesday. And I'm not quite sure what it is. I can't quite read this. So it is current. I think, speaking on the issue, the sooner the better would be good on the standpoint of legislation. But if we wanted to take more time to look into it, we can.

to say, I guess, kind of going through the experience we just had, and we were actually encouraged to have our GSC piece wait until some type of criminal justice bill went through, but is it fair to say that, at a bare minimum we can say -- you know, I acknowledge Commissioner Cameron's point that there are probably a lot of -- at least in this area, there are a lot of experts out there than I, but at least say, obviously, we support and encourage efforts which make individuals more eligible for employment opportunities. Not just in our gaming sector but anywhere.

But I mean, you know, we know the

economic climate changed since the gaming bill passed. And, you know, I think our general message during the GSC discussion was the best -- you know, we want to help our licensee meet hiring goals, we also, obviously, subscribe to the notion that if somebody has an opportunity they're not become out getting into trouble.

I mean, is there a basic message we could send, without diving into the details, which I don't feel I'm prepared to address?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, we actually -- we actually discussed, at length I remember, the context of the automatic disqualification, at least one of the subsets of first number here, in terms of -- I remember statute had it at 10 years. There's a parallel here to the waiting period for felonies from 15 to 10 to 10 to five. So I think we've effectively weighed in, at least some of us. Not in a full consensus, I remember, or not unanimously on one of these, or a couple of these. Not all of them. And that's where, you know, where my notion of

understanding what some of these do is -- is limited but...

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You have as much experience as any of us on -- in some of these issues. What's your sense on these issues?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Well, I do have a lot of experience on it. But at the same time, I'm not sure that I would feel comfortable in stating a position, in my current position, you know, on these -- on these proposals at this time. If we had more time, I would welcome some presentations, maybe by the -- of the CSG or whoever the organizations are, or our spokesperson would be, you know, to us, to kind of refine the issues.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. But you don't want to give us the benefit of your experience on these issues at this point?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I don't think you have enough time. There's some that are relatively straightforward, but there are others that are not. I mean, they're relatively straightforward, not that it's

necessarily an easy decision to make. But that, you know, should the, you know, period of sealing of a felony conviction be further -- be further reduced. That's a fairly straightforward thing. Again, not that that's an easy decision, and there are arguments on -- you know, on both sides on that.

One area where it is not straightforward is this issue -- is of the distinction between the sealing of a record and an expungement of a record. And I think the current state of the law in Massachusetts right now is that there is no -- there's no avenue for actual expungement.

I think that the -- maybe, Ed, you know more about this than I do, but that I believe the SJC actually -- actually vacated a district court judge's expungement under very, very -- under very various sympathetic circumstances. I mean, somebody had been framed in some way, and the judge felt very badly about that and just wanted the record completely, literally expunged so that there

Page 239

was no -- there was no record of it. And they said that they -- the Court said that they didn't have authority to do that.

And there are First Amendment issues on all of this. First Amendment in terms of press, entitlement of the press to access to this information. And one of the background setting of that is that there have been instances in which police officers have been charged with, you know, with offenses, and then they were able to prevail upon a judge to have it expunged or sealed under circumstances that were, at least, questioned by investigative reporters, and that, that practice has been something that which the press outlets have been very, very sensitive to.

So there -- this is an area that is not simple, as a general matter. It's just good guy, bad guy. And there -- so I certainly wouldn't want to, on the record, states a position as I'm sitting here on these bullet points.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Well, the

Page 240

1 sense I get is some willingness to discuss it, 2 but a sense that we don't have enough 3 information to go forward at the moment. 4 Certainly, nothing that I could be authorized. 5 I mean, I think -- I think, probably, none of 6 us would be opposed to the characterization that you make, Commissioner Stebbins, but I'm 7 not sure that does the job. You know, just a 8 9 general feel good, you know, we're in favor of 10 opening opportunities. So why don't I go back to these 11 12 folks and say, if you'd like to pursue this 13 we're probably game, but we're going to need 14 some more information and maybe some 15 appearance here so we can talk to some people about it. Does that make sense? 16 17 Anything else? 18 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Makes a lot 19 of sense. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do I have a motion 21 to adjourn? 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So moved. 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor?

```
Page 241
 1
         Aye.
 2
                    COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
 3
                    COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
 4
                    COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
 5
                    COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
 6
                    CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Unanimous.
 7
                    (Proceeding concluded at 2:10 p.m.)
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

Page 242 1 **APPEARANCES:** 2 3 **GUEST SPEAKERS:** 4 Bruce Barnett, General Counsel, Suffolk Downs 5 Steve O'Toole, Director of Racing, Plainridge Park 6 Casino 7 Bob McHugh, President Harness Horsemen's Association of New England 8 9 Mary Corey, Harness Horsemen's Association of New 10 England 11 Jacqui Krum, Senior Vice President and General 12 Counsel, Wynn Resorts International 13 Peter Campot, Director of Construction, Wynn 14 Design and Development 15 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION: 16 17 Catherine Blue, General Counsel 18 Edward Bedrosian, Executive Director 19 Todd Grossman, Deputy General Counsel 20 Karen Wells, Director, IEB 21 Michael Sangalang, Digital Communications Coordinator 22 23 Alex Lightbown, Director and Chief Veterinarian, 24 Racing Division

Page 243 APPEARANCES CONT'D: MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION: Paul Connelly, Director of Licensing Elaine Driscoll, Director of Communications Joe Delaney, Construction Project Oversight Manager

CERTIFICATE

I, Brenda M. Ginisi, Court Reporter, do

I, Brenda M. Ginisi, further certify that

I, Brenda M. Ginisi, further certify that I

Proceedings recorded by verbatim means, and

Administrative Office of the Trial Court Directive

neither am counsel for, related to, nor employed

by any of the parties to the action in which this

hearing was taken and further that I am not

financially nor otherwise interested in the

transcript produced from computer.

the foregoing is in compliance with the

2

1

3

4 hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and 5 accurate transcript from the record of the

proceedings.

of Transcript Format.

outcome of this action.

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

BRENDA M. GINISI

Notary Public

2017.

WITNESS MY HAND THIS 14th of November

My Commission expires:

June 18, 2021